Encyclopaedia of Indian War of Independence

Vol. 8

Contents

1

Mahadev Govind Ranade

Mahadev Govind Ranade was a Chitpavan Brahmin like Gokhale and Tilak. He was born in 1842, and pursued a number of different fields as professions in British India. Having studied at Bombay University, where his was the first batch to graduate, he taught Economics, History and Literature. He later moved into Law, where he earned his name. Soon afterwards Ranade was appointed subordinate judge in the Pune courts. It was here that he became an activist, seeking to undo age old traditions and ideas that in his estimate had kept Indians, especially Hindus backward. Unable to partake in national politics, being a judge, he chose instead to work for social reform through his high office. He became the indefatigable crusader for women's rights, and doing away with unnecessary customs that have choked progress.

Ranade was an enemy of obscurantism. In his articles and essays he contested the notion of revival putting forth the idea of reform. It must be said here, that in this respect the Hindu society seems to be 100 years ahead of the Muslim society, for Ranade didn't merely give the idea, but implemented it as well. What we see today in South Asia, is that the issue of modernity is a settled one amongst the Hindus. Sure there are some on the fringes that still speak of the ancient wisdom, but for the most part, the Hindus see them as part of a continuous evolving society. The Hindus have realized that the reason why they have managed to live under foreign rule, which more often than not aimed at changing their very way of life, is because they have always adapted themselves to new challenges and a great majority of

them have been pragmatic enough to leave their ancient practices and walk with the dictates of time.

The Hindu society might be religious, traditional and cultural, but it has never been dogmatic, since no scripture, idea or thought has ever achieved such primacy as not be questioned. Within the Vedas, the most sacred of Hindu traditions, we see a continuous movement, so much so that towards the end it becomes a precursor to the Upanishads. While trying to convince Jinnah of the idea of a separate Muslim state in the north west India, Iqbal had mentioned of how the Hindu society could never be democratic, because such a situation will mean an end to Hindu society. Had he qualified it with "as we know it" it would have made sense. The only certain characteristic of the Hindu society is its willingness to change and adapt. 68 years later, we see that the Hindu society continues to grow by leaps and bounds, while the Muslim society has fallen behind as a whole.

Ranade realized this essential quality of the Hindu society better than the revivalist leaders including those like Gandhi who came later. He blasted any notions of revival, saying that reform was key for the society's evolution. Rhetorically he asked if society should return to a time when a man had many wives, or when a woman had many husbands. He asked the revivalists if the way forward was to institute "Sati". He blasted any and all notions of "ancient ways". Why should the Hindus return to the customs that our fore fathers had rejected, asked Ranade and he was right. He stood for equal rights for men and women, which he forcefully strove for in his capacity as a government official.

One could compare Ranade to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the great educationist and reformer. I feel however that Sir Syed's role was limited in scope for he only aimed at improving the lot of the dispossessed Muslim gentry. Renade, though loyal to the British, sought to awaken social and political consciousness of the people, while Sir Syed Ahmed Khan seemed satisfied by simply making Muslims clerks and officials in the British Empire. There is no doubt that Aligarh Muslim University was to later fuel the political consciousness of the Muslim community, but Sir Syed

Ahmed Khan's decision of keeping the Muslims out of the Congress was a crucial blow. Ranade, in fact, had written a number of letters against Sir Syed's decision to keep the Muslims out of the Congress Party. Those letters make interesting reading and go a long way in explaining the varying points of view of the Muslim gentry and the nascent Hindu bourgeoisie. Ranade no doubt embodied the best of the hopes, aspirations and wishes of the Hindu bourgeoisie, which had through its enterprising and adapting nature, seen a time of its greatest prosperity under the British rule, which perhaps it can achieve again, now in the age of "I T". A better comparison can be made with Syed Ameer Ali, who like Ranade was a judge, historian and a reformer. However Syed Ameer Ali's impact, though profound on the Turks, has been marginal on the Muslims of South Asia.

How relevant a lesson is Ranade's life and work for the Hindu society, for the Muslims of today? The debate has been going on between revival and reform for a very long time in the Muslim community, but lately it seems that the revivalists have become stronger. Perhaps it is time for a Muslim Ranade, or many Muslim Ranades, as lawyers, judges, historians, journalists and teachers who will help reform the Muslim society like that great man did, over a 100 years ago.He was among the foremost reformers who deprecated the caste system and untouchability, favoured the enhancement of the status of women and was a champion of widow re-marriage. Ranade believed that unless social reforms were achieved, there could be no real economic or political progress.His method for the conduct of the nationalist movement was unique. He wanted the people to first remove their own inherent defects and when that was achieved, he felt the movement would become so forceful as to make the continuance of the British rule impossible.

The central thesis of Ranade was that we should introduce reform in such a way that no violence was done to ancient customs and traditions. In 1871 he was appointed successively as Third Presidency Magistrate, Fourth Judge of the Small Causes Court and Acting First Class Grade Judge at Poona. In 1893 he was appointed a Judge of the High Court of Bombay. He held this

position until his death on 17 January 1901. He was a founder member of the Indian National Congress and his influence was all pervasive. A reformer, lover of justice, believer of equality among all, in the words of Sir Pherozshah Mehta, he was a modern rishi. The India of the past, we can never hope to revive, but the India of the future is for us to shape and to fashion. The India that is to be born will have no room for any distinction of race, creed or colour. Let us be Indians first, and Indians to the last.? This call was made a hundred years ago by a great Indian social reformer and educationist, Mahadeo Govind Ranade. The last sentence found an echo in the speech of every leader who followed him. Ranade was a founder of the Social Conference movement, which he supported till his death.

He directed his social reform efforts against infant marriages, the shaving of widows' heads, the heavy cost of marriages and other social functions, and the caste restrictions on travelling abroad. He advocated widow remarriage and female education in an extremely orthodox society. He set an example by educating his young illiterate wife, Ramabai by getting an English lady tutor at home.

This angered the ladies in his household and they saw to it that she took a bath as soon as the lady went away! Mahadeo was born on January 18, 1842, at Niphad in the district of Nasik. His father Govind Rao Ranade was the administrator in the princely state of Kolhapur. When he was 13, Mahadeo was sent to Bombay (now Mumbai) where he joined Elphinston College. In due course, he took his M.A., L.L.B, and L.L.B. Honours earning distinctions and receiving scholarships throughout his academic career. In later life, he helped many poor students. His attempts to reform society often met with criticism, but he bore it without malice.

He was also of a forgiving nature. Once while travelling by train, a British officer who got into his compartment threw out Ranade's luggage. Ranade, however did not take any action against the officer. But he did not spare anyone while doing his duty. He punished an Englishman, by sending him to jail for six months, for stealing Rs 50. On an earlier occasion, he had imprisoned an Indian for one month for stealing Rs 100. When he was criticised

of partiality, his reply was that the Englishman had planned the theft while the Indian had given in to temptation.

When the Congress was formed by A. O. Hume, he joined it unofficially as he was in government service. His support to the objectives of the Congress prompted Mr Hume to call him his "political guru". Ranade passed away on January 16, 1901.

Justice M.G. Ranade was a great political thinker and religious and social reformer. He was one of the founders of the Indian National Congress; he also founded the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha. Inspired by the Brahmo Samaj, Justice Ranade espoused the principles of enlightened theism based on the Ancient Vedas. As founder of the Social Conference Movement, he devoted himself to the cause of social reforms, focusing on the problems of child marriage and the plight of widows. He fought against the evil of dowry system which was a curse, especially on the poor; he also laid great stress on widow remarriage and female literacy. A renowned Marathi scholar, he advocated the need for translation of standard English works into Marathi so that it could be read by many more people which, he felt, could help in spreading the concept of liberalism with its modern dimensions in India.

Justice Ranade was also a renowned jurist who left the indelible imprint of his intellect on Indian jurisprudence. More than anything else, Justice Ranade has been acknowledged by many as the founder of 'Indian political economy', who, through his informed and analytical writings, 'challenged the universality of classical economics and its applicability to India under all circumstances'. While advocating India's development along modern lines, he also delineated a political economy of growth in which related fields like industry, agriculture, foreign trade and the role of the State were closely interlinked. Generations of Indian leaders have benefited from Justice Ranade's perceptive understanding of India's political economy.

At the core of all his arguments was the imperative of making India a progressive, modern and self-reliant nation where equity and inclusiveness permeated all actions of the institutions of the State. More than a century after his death, Justice Ranade's

profound understanding of our socio-political and economic realities remains a beacon for the national leadership. As we near the Diamond Jubilee Celebrations of our Independence, it is only appropriate that we pay our homage to this outstanding statesman and introspect on our achievements and shortcomings in the last six decades.

In the wake of freedom, our Founding Fathers, inspired by the values of the Freedom Struggle, crafted a unique scheme of governance in which Parliamentary Democracy was cemented as the corner-stone of our constitutional edifice. They also amalgamated the principle of separation of powers with the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty in a manner underlining the primacy of the people in a democratic system and at the same time reinforcing the principle of constitutionalism.

No doubt, they were greatly influenced by the profound thinking of eminent leaders like Justice Ranade which were adequately reflected in the Constitution that we gave ourselves. Ranade's ideal of social equality and the welfare of the poor, the downtrodden and the weaker sections was very much reflected in our objectives of socio-economic development. The system of governance based on the principles of separation of powers among the organs of State was adopted keeping in mind the broader paradigm of speedy and comprehensive development of all sections of our people which we envisaged under the Constitution.

The fact that we have sustained the system of parliamentary democracy for all these years, may be with some imperfections, is definitely a matter of pride for all of us. Having come through fourteen General Elections which witnessed enthusiastic participation from our people, and having experienced a good degree of political stability for about five and a half decades, no one today will dispute that Indian Democracy has come of age and that it is here to stay. This democratic consolidation, preserving and protecting the unity of a heterogeneous country with one billion plus people, practising different religions, speaking innumerable languages, and home to a wide variety of cultures, customs and practices, has indeed been a remarkable achievement of post-independent India.

Today, we take great pride in asserting ourselves as the largest working democracy in the world and this is as it should be. But, we have to introspect about the quality of democracy that we have achieved and see to what extent our democracy has made a difference to the lives of the common people. All of us realize that we still have a very long way to go in achieving our developmental potential and in fully consolidating the gains of six decades of democratic functioning.

While proudly claiming to be steadfastly proceeding towards an enviable double-digit growth rate, we cannot overlook the fact that a substantial section of our people still live below the poverty line. In the UNDPs developmental ranking, India still occupies an unenviable 127th position. Growing instances of social tension across the country and the disturbing indications of frustration and helplessness experienced by our farming community are issues that should engage the attention of the whole country, particularly of all those associated with the institutions of governance at different levels today. Compounding such tension on the socio-economic fronts is the not so encouraging political scenario in the country. We have to admit that we have not been able to realize the full potential of democratic governance to the benefit of all our people in the past six decades. If we do not succeed in addressing the concerns of the people, there is a great risk that they will lose faith in democracy as a viable system capable of meeting their expectations.

Today the sanctity of our democratic processes and institutions are being compromised in different ways. The visible intrusion of divisive forces into the political arena, the recurring scenes of disorder and chaos and at times even destruction, associated with the functioning of our representative bodies, the reducing space for debate and discussion and the growing demonstration of intolerance towards opposite ideologies, and the spread of the politics of hatred are seriously vitiating the democratic culture in our country contributing in turn to growing public cynicism about the efficacy of democracy in addressing the concerns of the people. Added to this is the attempt by some institutions to malign and marginalize important people's fora with an intent to occupy

larger space than what is ideally feasible in a representative democratic system.

All institutions of governance, particularly our people's representative bodies, at different levels, should be concerned about it and endeavour to restore true democratic culture and the spirit of constitutionalism into their functioning. As Gandhiji had cautioned us, democracy can flourish only in an atmosphere of tolerance: 'Evolution of democracy is not possible if we are not prepared to hear the other side. We shut the doors of reason when we refuse to listen to our opponents or, having listened, make fun of them. If intolerance becomes a habit, we run the risk of missing the truth.'

To restore people's faith in democracy, it is, therefore, imperative for us to correct the prevailing image of disorder, divisiveness, intrigue, partisan and senseless confrontation, corruption and dishonesty associated with some areas of our political and democratic life.

It is axiomatic to say that each organ of the State - the Legislature, the Judiciary and the Executive - is required to function in conformity with the Constitutional mandate. As the supreme representative and law-making body, the Legislature has been accorded a pre-eminent position in our constitutional and political set-up. The power to make laws, its control over the nation's purse, the Executive being made accountable to the popular House, its role in the election and impeachment of the Head of State as well as in the removal of incumbents of high constitutional offices, including those of the higher Judiciary, its constituent powers, and its powers during an emergency, testify to such pre-eminence. Of course, even the Legislature has to function within the confines as laid down by the Constitution.

While delineating the powers of every organ, the Constitution also visualized that each of them would work in harmony with the other and only in the larger public good. The framers of our Constitution took utmost care to provide for an independent and impartial Judiciary, as an interpreter of the Constitution and as the custodian of the rights of the citizens. However, they envisioned

that the courts too have the mandate only to interpret the laws and not to enter into a discussion as to what the law should be nor to lay down general norms of behaviour for the government and the people to be considered binding on all as the law of the land. The scope of judicial review thus is confined to see whether an impugned legislation falls within the competence of the Legislature or is consistent with the Fundamental Rights guaranteed by the Constitution and its other basic features.

As per the constitutional provisions, the Parliament and State Legislatures show the highest respect and regard for the judicial body. The Rules of Procedure of the Parliament ensure that the image of the Judiciary is not tarnished in any way by any action of our Legislative Bodies. In fact, there has always been a consensus among the community of parliamentarians to strike a balance among the various organs of State so as to enhance the prestige and dignity of the institutions of our polity. If the institutions of governance do not respect each other eventually our people will lose faith in all of them.

The supremacy of the Constitution, parliamentary democracy, the principle of separation of powers, the independence of the Judiciary and the limited amending powers of Parliament have been spelt out, at different times, as among the basic features of the Constitution. What is important in this context is that all organs of State have to judiciously look at different perceptions of specific issues and ensure that the constitutional mandate is not violated and that ultimately all laws exist for the people rather than the other way around. They also have to make efforts to strengthen the linkages between the different organs as otherwise, the stability of the entire edifice of our democratic structure would be in jeopardy.

To my mind, the Rule of Law is at the very core of our Constitution. It should permeate the way in which we are governed. It requires that those who exercise powers should be conditioned by law and not be allowed to act in an arbitrary or unlawful manner so that the people can obtain the protection of law as and when required. It is only to guard against the abuse of powers

that a constitutional structure of power-relationship with checks and balances was devised and safeguards provided for under our Constitution, whether expressly or by implication.

In this context, one cannot avoid inviting attention to a matter which pertains to what is called 'judicial activism' which has gained ground in recent years, eliciting both admiration and criticism from various quarters. One will acknowledge the contribution made by our Judiciary in providing justice through the innovative system of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) to the oppressed citizens, especially those belonging to the vulnerable sections who have no means, no facilities and, in fact, no possibility on their own to approach the court even in cases of glaring injustice and discrimination. But, we have traveled a long way from that laudable objective. On many occasions, the Supreme Court itself has felt it necessary to condemn motivated and frivolous approaches to Court in the garb of PIL.

There is a feeling that in this process there is not only proliferation of cases but also near obliteration of the contours of the specific jurisdictions of the different organs of the State for which the doctrine of Separation of Powers has been clearly engrafted in our Constitution. Such assumption of jurisdiction at times inhibits many well-meaning executive authorities from discharging their functions according to their judgment and obligation.

At times judicial interventions borders on discharging executive and legislative functions, which cannot be called into question by anybody, if they are decided by the Apex Court and have to be enforced in spite of their undesirability from the point of view of those who are entrusted with the duty to make laws as also of those expected to give effect to them and in spite of being against the scheme of the Constitution itself. To my mind, it would be desirable if no organ of the State, in the name of public good, enters into the arenas specifically earmarked for others by the Constitution. With all humility, one can say that there should be no assumption that any particular organ has a monopoly of concern for the people. Such a notion in itself is undemocratic and

against the accepted cannons of constitutionalism. Ideally Rule of Law has to be enforced only by diligently and effectively discharging each one's assigned responsibilities in harmonious relationship in the larger public good.

Another issue of concern to all well-meaning people in the country of late has been the emergence of divisive forces on the national political scene. In a plural society like ours, it should be the concern of all to strive for and promote the feeling of oneness and unity among the diverse sections of our people. Maintenance of a secular social order assumes special significance here. Justice Ranade who was a great votary of liberalism wrote prophetically a century ago, and I quote:

The spirit of liberalism implies a freedom from race and creed prejudices and a steady devotion to all that seeks to do justice between man and man, giving to the rulers the loyalty that is due to the law they are bound to administer, but securing at the same time to the ruled the equality which is their right under the law. (Unquote)

Secularism is an essential quality to be promoted by the Indian State and all other stake-holders in our democratic functioning, if our national unity and integrity are to be sustained. We need to constantly highlight issues which unite the nation than which divide it, so that we could develop with our united strength and without wasting our national energies on trivialities and chanelise them effectively for the common good.

Democracy cannot be complete as also inclusive without the effective participation of women who constitute one-half of our population, a cause on which Justice Ranade laid great emphasis all through his lifetime. While universal adult suffrage has enfranchised them, what is needed is to create conditions to enable them to participate in the democratic processes in a more purposive and dignified manner. Today, there is a growing realisation that empowerment of women cannot be achieved by ensuring their representation at the lower levels of our democratic institutions alone. To make it truly effective, we need to provide for their participation in the higher levels of representation as well. A

recognition of and commitment to the pivotal role of women in our political and decision-making processes, thus, is another positive trend in contemporary Indian democracy.

Friends, among large sections of our people today, there is widespread disillusionment with the content and quality of our political discourse. More than ever before, people, especially the younger generations, are clamouring for more transparency, probity and good governance from our leaders and political parties. It is important that our institutions of democracy, particularly our leaders recognize these genuine apprehensions and frustrations of our people and seek to address them. The leadership has to be proactive and pragmatic at once, responding to the demands of the times. With the right to information having become a viable tool in the hands of our people, the expectations are bound to rise. All stakeholders, especially the institutions of the State, political parties, the media, the academia and the civil society groups together will have to necessarily take appropriate measures to address these challenges before our polity today.

The foundations of our democracy can be strengthened only when every institution that constitute our governance structure performs at its best keeping the interest of the people and the country in mind and in conformity with the fundamental law of the land, our Constitution. The Executive has to be seen to be functioning to address the concerns of the people, the Legislature reflecting the urges and aspirations of the people and the larger national causes as opposed to narrow partisan politics and the Judiciary as an independent arbiter dispensing speedy and inexpensive justice to every section of the people, remaining within the ambit of the scheme of the Constitution. It is also expected of the media, the intellectuals and the civil society groups to help in consolidating the gains of freedom and to enhance the credibility of our democratic life.

Everyone should work as collaborative partners in this national endeavour. No institution should try, directly or indirectly, to undermine the strength of any other institution. We must recognize that there is a symbiotic relationship between institutions of the

State. There is no super-organ to control and dominate the others. If we do anything that could weaken one, its adverse consequences will be felt by the entire system. It was with that spirit of cooperation and unity that our Founding Fathers like Justice Ranade worked for our freedom and for the establishment of a democratic order in the country.

In these uncertain and tumultuous times, we can draw inspiration from the vision of India as delineated by Justice Ranade more than a century ago, and I quote:

With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly with all, with unclouded intellect and powers fully cultivated and, lastly, with a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world, and be master of the situation and of her own destiny. This is the goal to be reached - this is the promised land. Happy are they who see it in distant vision, happier they who are permitted to work and clear the way on to it, happiest they who live to see it with their own eyes and tread upon the holy soil. (Unquote)

It is such profound and prophetic words which should remain our beacon at all times. Justice Ranade was, undoubtedly, among those who had such great vision about India, but did not live to see it unfolding in a free India while it is our good fortune to see the signs of emergence of a resurgent India today. But what is important is to ensure that we do not leave anyone behind in the process of realizing that vision, but take everyone along and help realize and actually experience the fruits of those dreams.

2

Perceptions of the Indian Social Structure by the Nationalists and Social Reformers

INTRODUCTION

This unit concerns with the perception of reformists and nationalists. The perception of a group is always context-specific and is filled with remembrance and anticipation. It opens us to past as well as to future, within the lived, ongoing present. The social-structure is multi-layered and our perceptions order the multiple realities into a coherent whole.

The reformists and nationalists in India is nineteenth and twentieth century witnessed a cultural encounter between their indigenous society and culture with the colonial modernity. The colonial modernity brought to India the perceptions and imaginations of the Western bourgeoisie through its print-culture. The printed page whose technology was imported from the west, accustomed the eye to the presentation of messages in a formal, visual space.

Along with this innovation, the colonial modernity also introduced the indigenous educated classes to the epistemic presupposition of development-in-time. Yet the indigenous oral culture and notion of cyclical time survived along with other cultural and historical legacies of indigenous social institutions and structures. These twin legacies ordered the universe of indigenous intelligentsia and this is the subject of this unit.

SOCIAL BACKGROUND

The social background of a group plays a very significant role in shaping its perception. Although, there cannot be one-to-one correspondence between social and class background and perception of a group, (perception is an independent, autonomous individual activity that involves intentionality of the perceiving subject and this accounts for variations even within a group) the class background of nationalists imparted some general characteristics to their perception of prevalent social-structure. Generally speaking, as most of the nationalists were of a liberal democratic persuasion, they believed in the sanctity and security of private property and also upheld the virtues of social-hierarchy. According to Prof, Bipan Chandra, diverse political and ideological trends co-existed and simultaneously contended for hegemony within the wide spectrum of nationalist ideology, however, most of them tended to ignore and downplay the internal contradictions of Indian society in terms of class, caste and religious divisions. The Nationalist leadership came mainly from the upper caste and class, western educated urban middle class professionals.

There was not much urbanization during the first half of the 19th century in India. The percentage of population residing in towns of more than 5,000 inhabitants remained stationary between 10-11 percent. However, the picture was not so static as the nature and character of urban centres changed significantly under the colonial rule. Some old towns linked with administrative and military functions of indigenous ruling houses declined and some new towns especially those functioning as major warehouses for distant markets emerged, stimulated by commercial colonial economy. One peculiar urban form associated with colonialism was 'port-city'. We can take up the example of Calcutta to show impact of such urban centres on the indigenous socio-cultural life.

The European or White town, constructed as per the English urban models, was confined to a small part around Fort William. It was the headquarter of the East India company in India. About 3000 Europeans stayed there in vast houses surrounded by wide avenues and green spaces. But the majority of 2,30,000 Indians in

1837 who made up the Block-city, stayed in a number of localities (paras). Each para had developed around the domain of a merchant family, each having its own market and other services necessary for its functioning. Such cities were to become the centres of social and cultural life for the indigenous elite. All zamindar families of Bengal had a residence in Calcutta and members of intelligentsia initially either came from this group or were dependent on this group. However, new opportunities, associated with western education, new printing technology and capitalist enterprise gradually replaced this dependence.

The indigenous elite wished to acquire western knowledge and proficiency in English language, but did not always seek to imitate the English or Europeans in all aspects of life. The initiative to learn English and Western science came from the upper caste and upper class Hindus as early as 1817 who established the Hindu College in Calcutta. The print-culture also came with colonialism. The first modern press established by William Carey (The Baptist Missionary) in 1801 at Serampore, published, along with the translations of Bible, the first works of modern Bengali prose, and a Darpan (1818). Anew class of indigenous intellectuals emerged in this process of importing western knowledge and technology of print, though it still came from the upper castes who enjoyed the privilege of literacy in the pre-colonial times. Soon, it became independent of the local zamindars and landed magnates. The Macaulay's Minute (1835) accelerated the process, although his own aim was to produce Indians who would serve the British in subordinate positions.

The Wood's dispatch (1854) adopted a more coherent plan to develop education in India. Universities were established at the Presidency capitals of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1857 and between 1865-85, about 50,000 candidates passed the entrance examination to the university and about 18,000 earned a University degree. In addition to it, some others were enrolled in specialized professional courses and institutions such as Medical Colleges and engineering schools. These colonial- educational institutions were sources of both employment and intellectual influences. The legal profession was the main source of both employment and

intellectual influences. The legal profession was the main source of employment and at the end of 19th century, nearly 14,000 person were employed in this in the three Presidencies. The Vernacular Press and teaching offered other prospects. Some scholars even relate the emergence of Indian nationalism to the absence of satisfactory job opportunities among the indigenous elite sections.

This sounds too simplistic but there is little doubt that the colonial state followed a strategy to cultivate the urban professional classes, whose skills were essential to the business of administration. Social groups such as the Bengali bhadralok ('the respectable folk') and the Parsis of Bombay were drawn to the standard of the Raj not simply by financial and status rewards of public service but also by the heady allurements of western thought and culture. As early as 1877, Keshab Chanra Sen had expressed faith in the providential hand of the Raj. Gradually this faith in the providential aspect of the colonial state was shaken and moderate nationalists, whatever the weaknesses of their strategy, made a brilliant and thorough critique of the economic aspects of colonialism. The colonial social milieu had not only produced student clubs like the society for Acquisition of General knowledge (Calcutta, 1838), it also became a cradle for the development of political associations such as British Indian Association (Calcutta, 1851), Bombay Association (1852) and Native Association in Madras.

The colonial public space initially affected only an infinitesimal elite, not even the urban middle classes. When Indian National Congress was created in 1885 under the guidance of A.O. Hume, most of its delegates hailed from bourgeois big city professionals with a sprinkling of merchants and landowners. Eleven of first sixteen Congress Presidents were barristers. Badruddin Tyabji earned Rs. 122,000 from his legal practice in 1890, an amount that was four times the salary of a highly paid Indian Civil service (ICS) officer. Justice M.G. Ranade, was attended by some 21 coolies. Motilal Nehru, a highly successful lawyer of High Court, lived in a big mansion lit by electricity and drove a motor car when there were only a handful in the entire country. In short, they came

from wealthy sections of the society and enjoyed high social status in the hierarchy of traditional society. (Many were Brahmins actually). This social background naturally placed limitations on their form of patriotism and their imaginations. They were wedded to the system of property and apprehensive of sponsoring anything that might upset the social harmony and the hierarchical arrangement of society.

The foundational goal of the Indian National Congress reflected this. The principal demands of Indian National Congress were: reform of central and Provincial Legislative Councils (with greater powers and with acceptance of elective principle in representation), the Indianization of top-level administration by simultaneous organization of entrance examination to Indian Civil Service, both in England and India, judicial reform and access of Indians to the high ranks of the army. Other demands were economic in nature such as reduction of Home charges and military expenditure, the need to encourage technical education with a view to facilitate the industrial development of the country, the abolition of duty on alcohol and the extension of permanent settlement.

These issues were of interest only to a small section of privileged individuals within the indigenous society. The nationalist paradigm of development reflected the aspirations of the propertied sections to take India onto an independent course of capitalistic development, although some broader issues such as reduction of salt tax, betterment of conditions of Indian migrant labour working in colonial plantations and revocation of Forest Acts were included to give the programme a semblance of general public concern. As most of the members of Indian National Congress, especially in Bengal belonged to zamindars, the scope of agrarian programme remained very limited.

Infact, the nationalist intelligentia was operating in a context characterized by predominance of landed property over movable property and could hardly overcome the constraints imposed by these conditions. According to Cambridge historians, C.A. Bayly (1975) and R.A. Washbrook (1976), the intelligentia intervened into the public space, not as the representative of their own class

but as the agents of rural magnates or of the powerful banker traders of the cities. Such simplistic correlation leaves out the complex ideological strands that coloured the perceptions of the nationalist leadership. Still, it appears that they are limiting at the roots of question as to why the congress ultimately favoured a bureaucratic rather than mobiliziational form of carrying out the "passive revolution" or a gradual conservative social transformation in 1947 and, thus, retained the power of agrarian magnates in the countryside.

THE IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF NATIONALIST PERCEPTION

The colonial modernity that shaped many public institutions and policy measures entailed the notion of legal rights, sanctity and security of private property and capitalistic enterprise, modern printing and state regulated education. The nationalist leadership, while seeking to challenge the colonial state and its hegemony used an ideological amalgam or hybrid of 'modern' ideologies and 'invented' indigenous cultural resources. Therefore, the 'nationalism' was a multi-faceted phenomenon. The Congress leaders, who had imbibed the liberal consciousness and who were also guided by a modernistic credo, wished to create a civil society in India on the model of European society, a society of individuals that would be implicitly counter to descent groups. The extension of print culture and the colonial education with a standardized school curriculum stimulated the growth of such a civil society in India and the nationalist leaders only wanted to accelerate this process.

However, as Rajat Kanta Ray (2003) has shown that "The pre-history of every national movement lies in emotions, identities and notions" (p.5) The idea of a 'nation-in-the-making' might have been new, but popular mentality and emotions were rooted in the past cultural-historical legacies. In other words, identities in the colonial milieu were not created all of a sudden they were rooted in "the raw, unfashioned feeling of the multitude" (Ray, 2003, p. 34). One way to avoid being caught in the trap of multiple and competing religious and cultural identities was to refuse to make social reform an objective of political action. Therefore, the social

issues were not tackled directly during the annual sessions of the Congress, rather they were discussed in an Indian Social Conference, outside the framework of the Congress under the guidance of M.G. Ranade.

The colonial state also provided encouragement to the redefinition of social identities by its own initiative. The decennial censuses started enumerating people according to the caste-status and there was a competition among many sub-castes to claim a high varna-status. This expanded the axis of 'horizontal solidarities' through a number of caste-associations that fostered supra-local identities especially in towns where it was difficult to observe ritualistic prescriptions. Similarly, the Cow Protection Agitation (1893) in North India, a movement against the slaughter of cows, also consolidated a Pan-Hindu identity. Earlier, the Hindus were a disparate collection of castes, sects and local cults that followed a congeries of religious practices.

The new Hindu 'collectivity' also brought merchant and artisans into the public arena. The educated nationalist intelligentsia, nevertheless, hardly seemed preoccupied at this juncture with the questions of religious and communal identity. Many of them seemed to concur with the criticism of Christian missionaries directed against the 'evils of Indian Society'. The consolidation of caste-solidarities did not bother them as they were wedded to the notion of social-hierarchy and caste was the best representation of the principle of hierarchy. What some of them, especially the Extremist faction led by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal, questioned was the right of colonializers to interfere in the beliefs and faith of the indigenous people. While some people like M.G. Ranade agreed to the criticism of social evils on the basis of Western Conception of rationality, the revivalistic strand in nationalist politics perceived the Indian Social structure from a contrary point of view.

Lala Lajpat Rai wrote in 1904 in an article entitled 'Reform Revival': "cannot a revivalist arguing in the same strain, ask the reformers into what they wish to reform us? Whether they want us to be reformed on the pattern of the English or the French?

Whether they want us to accept the divorce laws of Christian society or temporary marriages that are now so much in favour in France or America? Whether they want to make men of our women by putting them into those avocations for which nature never meant them?

In short, whether they want to revolutionize our society by an outlandish imitation of European customs and manners and a diminished adoption of European vice?" However, a simplistic demarcation between tradition and modernity is not possible and the hybrid that evolved due to interaction between modernity of the west and the indigenous traditions involved many ambiguities and ambivalences. The issue was addressed again and again in the nationalist discourse. The colonial milieu produced intellectuals who adopted different routes to seek a transcendence from the oppressive present. Nehru had hinted at the basic ambivalence involved in this cultural encounter and described the Indian middle class dilemma to choose between modernism and a search for the cultural roots in the past. Aurobindo Ghosh had wished for a synthesis of oriental values and occidental ideas in the following words in an essay 'New Lamps for Old', published on 4th December, 1893: "No one will deny - that for us, and even for those of us who have a strong affection for original oriental things and believe that there is in them a great deal that is beautiful, a great deal that is serviceable, a great deal that is worth keeping, the most important objective is and must inevitably be the admission into India of occidental ideas, methods and culture".

NATIONALISTS'PERCEPTION OF INTERNAL SOCIAL DIVISIONS

The main agenda of nationalist leadership, with all its multi-faceted composition and ideological variations was to put together a civil society. However, the creation of a civil society and nation is always a par of ideologically engineered modern world. The nationalist faced no problem in opposing the bureaucratic intrusions of Indian society by the colonial state, even if some of them were, on the surface, at least guided by altruistic motives (such as famine relief and free vaccination against diseases). They

could be easily depicted as the agenda of an alien government to wean away the Indians from their ancestral beliefs and customs, thus, requiring resistance from indigenous society.

In a similar fashion, the economic penetration and imposition of land-revenue policies, forest Acts through an alien bureaucracy could be held responsible for the moral and material degradation of indigenous society. The economic backwardness and primitiveness of Indian social institutions was linked to lack of sufficient modernization and transfer of resources from India to England due to preponderance of vested colonial interests. However, a more vexatious question was how to deal with some of pre-colonial social cleavages of caste, class, gender and religious nature. Contrary to what some scholars believe, not all of them were 'invented' by the colonial rulers. Some of them were modified, distorted and used by the colonial rulers. For instance, religious division was used selectively to patronize a particular religious community in the system of separate electorate. In some cases, the religious divisions were enmeshed into an intricate web of property-relations at local level.

These were also other irreconcilable contradictions such as between landowning dominant farmers and the landless agricultural labour, and capital and labour in the new urban centres. There were also contestations between the dominant, upper castes and lower caste groups. The system of agrestic serfdom or bonded labour had existed even in the pre-colonial periods due to a peculiar caste-class configuration that maintained landlessness among the lower castes. The nationalists, even when they were aware of many of these contradictions, tended to ignore them. They had no intention of challenging the existing pattern of social prestige and hierarchy.

They gave primacy to the contradiction between colonialism and the entire Indian society. Poona Sarvjanik Sabha (1870), in its manifesto had declared that its members were to be "men of respectability, inamdars or proprietors of land, savkars or money lenders, merchants, government officers, pleaders, professors and most of the ruling chiefs of the Southern Maratha country." It is, therefore, not surprising that the Indian educated classes were

divided even over the support to a mild reform like Behram Malabari's campaign against early marriage and a need to raise the legal minimum age of marriage from 10 to 12 for girls. [The Age of Consent Bill Controversy (1891)]. Although aware of the inherent social contradictions in the indigenous social structure, the social conference under the leadership of M.G. Ranade did not want "to kick the old ladder" yet talked about "re-casting family, village, tribe and nation in new moulds".

Ranade also lamented that the colonial state had done away with the traditional protection of person and property. He, therefore, wished to achieve a harmonious integration of hierarchically ordered village society with a paternalistic hand. Ranade emphasized the credit functions of sahukars (money lenders) in the wake of the Deccan Peasant Revolt (1875) and established Poona lavad (arbitration) court on the model of traditional village Panchyat, which would function to achieve an informal but effective compromise in both public and private conflicts (beyond the contractual British model). This was like an attempt to restore an old institution that had decayed because of violent innovation under the destructive impact of colonialism. The Gandhian imagination of a 'Ram-rajya' with its 'idyllic village communities and his idealization of small scale village cottage industries, even while making some qualified exception to the use of labour saving moden machines, became a symbol of nationalist challenge to the colonial penetration of Indian society and its institutions.

However, Gandhi selectively ignored the class questions and wished to resolve them through the policy of adjustment of class-interests and harmony. Mahatama Gandhi had organized the textile workers of Ahmedabad in the form of Ahmedabad Textile labour Association and under-took a fast of 21 days to get bonus from the capitalist employers in 1918. Subsequently, Gandhi stayed away from the militant actions of industrial labour. The Gandhian Ahmedabad Textile Labour Association promoted the ideology of class-harmony between labour and capital. Gandhi employed the notion of Trusteeship for the capitalists and perceived the employers as the trustees of the society who would work for the

benefit of the workers. The other prominent nationalist leaders who were associated with labour organization such as B.P. Wadia, V.V. Giri, C.R. Das and even Jawaher Lal Nehru also favoured a constitutionalist and reformist line of action in labour-struggle.

Similarly on the agrarian front, although some congress leaders especially those belonging to the Congress Socialist camp organized peasants and tenants against the semi-feudal oppression, the general approach was to ignore internal differentiation within peasantry. The Right wing conservatives within congress, on the other hand, directly sided with the feudal landlords. The most marginalized section dependent on agriculture, the agricultural labour was not on the agenda at all. M.G. Ranade had favoured transfer of land from inefficient poor peasants to resourceful, rich and inefficient poor peasants to resourceful, rich and efficient farmers on the ground of economic rationality. R.C. Dutt had defended the Zamindari or Permanent Settlement as a rational and just act of the British in India.

Similarly, while perception of caste differed and while some regarded it as the essence of Indian social structure, others were aware of the harmful effects of caste, no systematic anti-Caste ideology was worked out. Even the radical wing of Congress thought that the institution of caste will wither away with industrialization and modernization of society. Gandhi repeatedly addressed women in his political discourse and regarded them as a regenerative force. He permitted and encouraged their active participation in the public and political life, especially after 1930. On the other hand, the roles he expected for them we as mothers and supporters of men and as examples of self- sacrifice and non-violence, as spinners of Khadi. Gandhi considered women most worthy in their traditional place and avocation i.e. concerned with household tasks and upbringing of children. Thus, the vision and imagination of Gandhi was coloured with patriarchal values.

REFORMERS

Concepts of socio religious movements and its theme dimensions: The term 'socio' implies an attempt to reorder society in the areas of social behaviour, custom, structure or control.

Amovement or its reformers may have sought to reshape any one of these components or a combination of them. All socio-religious moments demanded changes, ranging from a relatively limited approach of defensive and self consciously orthodox groups to radicals who articulated a sweeping condemnation of status quo. The term 'religious' refers to the type of authority used to legitimize a given ideology and its accompanying programmes.

This authority was based on scriptures that were no longer considered to be properly observed or a reinterpretation of doctrine or on scriptural sources arising from the codification of a new religious leader's message. At times different types of authority were combined to legitimize a particular programme. The teachings of an individual once adopted by his disciples were standardized, codified and transformed into an ideology that is a structured explanation of the present in terms of the past events. Such formulae also outlined a path towards the purified future, either for an individual or for society at large. The leader initially and later the ideology furnished the vehicle for an individual's participation in a particular movement.

Here the term movement refers to an aggregate of individuals united by the message of charismatic leader or the ideology derived from that message. Such a movement might be loosely organized especially during the life time of its founder, but if it was to last beyond his death his disciples needed to create and sustain a formal organizational structure. In short a socio-religious movement advocated modifications in social behaviour and justified such advocacy by one or another form of religious authority and then built an organizational structure it maintained over time.

The ultimate object of the reform movement as a whole, was the attainment of social happiness the well being of the people and national progress. For social salvation the intellectuals emphasized truth, equity and justice to be the governing values of future Indian society. M.G. Ranade wrote:

"The evolution that we seek is a change from constraint to freedom, from credulity to faith, from status to contract, from

authority to reason, from unorganized to organized life, from bigotry to toleration, from blind fatalism to a source of human dignity."

The intellectuals placed a very high premium on knowledge. Ignorance was viewed as a curse and attributed to as the root cause of the prevalence and doggedness of superstition and obscurantism in Indian society. Literacy in general and among women in particular was held responsible for national degeneration and backwardness.

The spread of education was therefore accorded a primary position in the scheme of reform. Nearly all the intellectuals held education to be a panacea for all problems. The conviction in the instrumentality of knowledge as the most effective agent of social transformation and national regeneration was a significant feature of the (19th thought. In contrast to the British educational policy which was not geared to the needs of material advancement of our country the educational programme of the intellectuals on the contrary aimed at the material development of the country.

They stood for the extinction of the privileges of the higher castes in the existing educational arrangements. They were opposed to the monopoly of learning by certain upper castes and classes, and proposed the spread of knowledge to all segments of society. Their constant concern was how to make popular education an activity.

To realize the objective of mass education Parmanand advocated free compulsory education upto the primary level. Nearly all the reformers laid stress on the growth of Indian vernaculars. It was deemed necessary to realize the goal of popular education.

They held that English as a medium of instruction could not be an effective instrument of any meaningful advance. The role of English education was to be confined to aiding and enriching the indigenous languages. In other words, it was to be an aid and never an instrument of social change. Ranade took the colonial policy to task for its neglect of Indian vernaculars.

Another significant concern of the intellectuals was female education. It was emphasized as the 'root of all reform' and social advancement. Illiteracy among women was viewed as one of the major causes of their pitiable plight and the general backwardness of the society.

They advocated not only primary education among the (19th intellectuals who first conceived of educating women for employment and professions, and stressed the expanding of women's role outside the home. The targets of the severest intellectual attack were the existing socio-cultural evils and malpractices such as obscurantism, superstition and irrationality embedded in the society.

The intellectuals did not however attack the social system as a whole; their attack centred only on the perversions and distortions that had crept into it. They did not advocate a sharp rupture in the existing social structure of the country. They did not stand for structural transformation; changes were sought within the framework of the very structure. They were advocates of reform and not revolution.

The upliftment of the position of women, late marriage, monogamy, widow-marriage, elimination of caste destructions, monotheism etc. did not signify any revolutionary change in the society. Even they themselves were not aware of the reformist nature of their ideas and endeavours. The course they delineated for transformation was to be evolutionary and not revolutionary. Nearly all believed in the gradual transformation of society.

SOME REFORM MOVEMENTS

Here we briefly introduce to you some of the reform movements.

The Swami Narayan Sect of Gujarat

Sahajanand Swami (1781-1830), a disciple of Ramananda Swami (1739-1802) popularized a puritanical ideology in Gujarat region. Swami Narayan sect's dissent from the established Hindu traditions, was limited to a few aspects of customs, particularly

with regard to the marriage customs, infanticide and the Van-Margist form of sectarian Hinduism.

It attacked Vani-Margas who worshipped female power (or Shakti) and practiced animal sacrifices, meat-eating, drinking and sexual rituals. Although women were also given a place as female religious mendicants or Sankhyayoginis and Swami Sahjanand challenged restrictions on widow-remarriage, the institution of sati and the custom of female infanticide yet thesect also upheld the basic values of the traditional patriarchal set-up.

Swami Sahajanand preached that a woman should obey her husband and worship him as a god. The Swami Narayana movement developed a hierarchical structure. At the apex was the acharya. Religious mendicants were recruited from all castes, but the future acharyas had to be Brahmin.

The mendicants were divided into three hierarchical orders, the brahmcharis, sadhus and patas. The brahamcharis had no caste marks but sadhus maintained caste restrictions and were limited to non-Brahmans of the second and third Varnas. The third category of patas were mainly from sudra varna or peasant castes and acted as temple servants and attendants. Untouchables were excluded from Swami Narayana's institutions except for the two specifically built for their use. Thus, the sect accepted hierarchical social structure as well as patriarchal social values and reinforced Brahmanical domination.

The Satnamis: The Satnamis, under the leadership of Ghasi Das, Balak Das and others, on the contrary, emerged from the untouchable castes mainly chamars of Chattisgarh and advocated a sort of equalitarianism. Ghasi Das maintained that all men were equal and thus, challenged caste as a social hierarchy. Ghasi Das wanted to change the dietary habits of his followers. Meat, liquor and anything that resembled flesh or blood was forbidden (e.g. tomatoes, lentils and red chillies).

The Satnamis were thus confirming the upper-caste customs primarily to improve their social status. Balak Das, the son of Ghasi Das was more radical in his opposition of caste-discrimination. He adopted the sacred thread worn by the upper

castes and the satnami movement acquired dimensions of social protest and rebellion against the upper castes. It also developed its own hierarchical system of priests and religious centres and a calendar of ritual events. It became confined to the chamars of Chattisgarh region. Briefly it challenged caste-system but finally returned to an existence within that very social set-up.

The Satya Mahima Dharma

Mukund Das or Mahima Gosain, Govinda Baba and Bhima Bhoi (an illiterate blind cow herd) were - figures of Satya Mahima Dharma who organized an opposition to orthodox Brahmanical domination in the field of religious rituals. Because of rejection of Brahmanical rituals and idol-worshop, the movement had a wide appeal among lower caste people, tribals and untouchables. Women could join the movement as devotees but they were forbidden to enter the monastic order of the movement. The Mahima sanyasis underlined their rejection of traditional social structure by refusing to take food from brahmans, princes, and some of the professional classes on the grounds that such food may not have been acquired in a righteous manner.

In an annual feast at Joranda (a sacred place for Mahima Dhamis because Mahima Gosain was buried there), all devotees joined together transcending caste restrictions. Under Bhima Bhoi, Vaishnavism and worship of Lord Jagannath were to become the main theme of their attacks. Because of this opposition of the traditional religious practices and Brahmanical form of worship, Satya Mahima Dharma drew support from the lower castes and tribal people who had little status and power within the traditional social structure.

The Satyasodhaks of Maharashtra

The social structure of Maharashtra was divided into Brahmans, non-Brahmans and untouchables. The Brahmans were generally the priests, landowners, estate managers and government servants, and thus concentrated the entire power within themselves. Jotirao Phule (1827-90) challenged the power of Brahmans. Realizing that even lower castes were also divided,

Phule tried to use a strategy in which he depicted all the shudras and Ati-shudras (untouchables) as the forgotten descendents of the heroic race of Kshatriyas of ancient India, led by the mythical daitya king Bali.

Phule represented Bali as a popular peasant king signifying the utopias of beneficence, castelessness and prosperity. Phule suggested that there was a permanent and irreconcilable hostility between Brahmans and all other castes. In his attempt to unite all lower-caste people, Phule accepted the 'Aryan race theory' as the basis of the Indian caste system but inverted it to serve his own radical aims.

The Satya Sodhaks under leadership of Mahatma Phule challenged the cultural and religious domination of Brahmans. In the Junnar campaign (1884) of the Satya sodhaks, the service castes refused to visit Brahmins, peasant cultivators (or Kunbis) refused to plough the lands of Brahmin landlords and Brahmans were not invited to conduct marriage ceremonies.

But while radically rejecting Brahmanical social structure, the satyasodhaks organized seprate caste association and conferences between 1907- 1933 of Marathas, Bhandaris, Malis, Shimpis, Agris, Parits, Salis, Mahars and Mangs for promoting educational activities among these castes, thus, implicitly legitimizing the separate caste-identity among them.

Perceptions of Islamic Reformers

Like 'Hindu' social reformers, the Islamic reformers also perceived indigenous social structure in diverse ways. Sayyid Ahmed Khan (1817-98), fascinated with western science, and knowledge felt depressed with the state of decadence of Muslim society in particular and India in general.

Toover come this state of indigenous society, he felt that some of the innovative features of English society-its discipline, orders efficiency and high level of literacy along with science and technology-must be adopted by the Muslim community. Sayyid Ahmed addressed himself to the members of ashraf (respectful descendents of past rulers) and stressed the importance of ancestry

and social status. He believed that western education and knowledge through institutions like the Mahammadan Anglo-Oriental College of Aligarh (1875) would create a generation of leaders who would unite the depressed Muslims into a single quam, a community no longer divided by sectarian strife, class tensions and issues of language.

Although Ahmad wanted to introduce some changes in behaviour and customs, he upheld the structure of social -hierarchy and class. Contrary to this, the Barelwi ulama led by Ahmad Riza Khan (1856-1921) defended contemporary customary practices and religion of Islam.

The Barelwis accepted a wide variety of customary practice, defended the established religious elite and showed no interest in western science. However, the Islamic movements of return like Deobandis linked the Ulama class-interests with the fortunes of the Muslim community. Although they did not ignore the ascendancy of English power, they looked for a new vision of purified religion and a resurgence of ulama.

The Deobandi curriculum was designed to prepare students for their role as members of the ulama and thereby strengthen the link between Islamic religion and culture and the Muslim community.

Although, they used English techniques and methods for erecting their educational institutions and raising funds, the structure of Islamic society, especially the ashraf classes provided broad support and financial resources for their endeavours.

The Fara'izis under the leadership of Shariat' Ullah (1781-1840) and his son Dadu Miyan also represented a return to a more puritanical Islam. In fact the term fara'iz meant the obligatory duties of Islam.

They wanted to purge Islam of polytheistic beliefs and other customs that prevailed among the uneducated, Muslim peasants of Bengal and which the Fairazis believed were because of influence of Hindu community on them. They challenged the beliefs of orthodox Muslims as well as Hinduism which was seen as the fountain of polytheism and all evil innovations. As the majority

of landlords in East Bengal region were Hindus, their ideological campaign got embroiled in the agrarian conflicts. They challenged the power of local landlords and indigo planters. Shariat 'Ullah asked his followers to reject the illegal demands of landlords such as collection of money for Durga Puja. His son, Dudu Miyan took a more radical stance and proclaimed that all land belonged to God and that land tax was both illegal and immoral. Such a perception of landed property was a direct attack on the power of landlords and popularized the fairazis among the Muslim peasantry.

SUMMARY

Thus we see that the perceptions of social reformers and nationalists of the Indian social structure cannot be viewed as a monolith.There were several strands to these perceptions. This was because each strand was grappling with the nature of society in its own specific context and time. The richness of the diversity of the perceptions then makes for the variations in the movements of social change. "So, you want to marry my daughter?"

3

Autonomy and Comparability: Notes on the Anticolonial and the Postcolonial

On the eve of his departure for a tour of Southeast Asia in July 1927, Rabindranath Tagore addressed a group of nationalists assembled at Calcutta University. He began by charting the familiar lines of his opposition to what he had elsewhere called the mechanistic "logic of the Nation." 1 Blinded by the "dust storm of modern history," Indian nationalists had succumbed to the global "hunger" for the central "political feast" of the age, namely, the goal of a sovereign nation-state.2 Seduced by a statist imaginary, they were in danger, Tagore warned, of eclipsing "the eternal grace of India [Bharat]" (198) that lay in the capacity to "see all as part of ourselves" (199) (its imminent universalism) and its "acceptance of sacrifice" (198) (its spiritual essence). At the turn of the century, in the context of the swadeshi (home manufactures) movement-the first attempt by the colonial middle class to effect a nationalist mass mobilization-Tagore had helped author the vision of autonomy that anchored popular visions of Bharat as an organically constituted nation.

In his post-swadeshi antinationalist incarnation, he sought the "inner truth" (198) of India in a literal and imaginative Greater India that was roughly congruent to a Pan-Asian world. Tagore urged a realignment of nationalism beyond the "barriers of external geography" and the nation formtoward this imagined, organically interlinked Pan-Asian world, one built on an "ethic of sacrifice"

rather than the "infliction of suffering" (198). Tagore's address powerfully articulated the spectral predicament of societies who bore the ideological stigmata of being historical "latecomers" in an era that seemed for many colonized intellectuals as that of the mechanical reproduction of European domination. Doomed to play a game of catch-up not of their own making, colonial subjects "had to imagine ourselves to be dream-made Mazzinis, Garibaldis and Washingtons; in our economic life we were caught in the labyrinth of imaginary Bolshevism, Syndicalism or Socialism" (197).

Entranced by the phantasmagoria of a globally ascendant national "dream-cinema" that was, for Tagore, irreducibly European in origin and content, Indians qua nationalists would remain passive spectators and consumers of histories and products "Made in Europe" (198). From this perspective, the estrangement of thought forms and subject constitution wrought by colonialism was indistinguishable from the European/Western intellectual genealogy of certain modern concepts and projects. The felt stigmata of derivativeness, the longing to overcome the "mirage" of Europe, expressed itself in a self-understood anticolonial epistemology that privileged acts of conceptual innovation over those of appropriation. Within the term of this schema, the index of autonomy was the relative indigeneity of everyday concepts and practices rather than the substantive transformations of received worlds of value and meaning. Nationalism, in this view, could only ever be a spectacular act of colonial ventriloquism, the bastard child of European hegemony.

Tagore's turn-of-the-century envisioning of a swadeshi samaj, an autonomous national society, had long morphed into a liberal internationalism. Yet his address captures, in a poetic register, the long echo of swadeshi: the intimacy between a political-economic vision of autarky (made in Bharat) and a substantively autonomous cultural space (whether located in the bounded national community of Bharat or in a wider Pan-Asian arena). His liberal internationalism shared with swadeshi discourse the categorical ideal born of an encompassing ethic of indigeneity and the self-conscious pursuit of forms of sociality and personhood untouched by the abstract logic of capitalism and exempt from the geographies of domination that constituted colonial worlds. What held together these apparently distinct formations beyond their common intellectual genealogy was their roots within the historically specific problem of colonial unevenness, the shared grappling with the mundane and spectacular differentiations wrought by the making of a colonial space-time.

The attempt to secure an autonomous space-time, one not beholden to what Tagore identified as the "mirage" of Europe, resonates with many of the normative and conceptual impulses that inflect recent subalternist works. For many subalternist historians, the specter of Europe names the developmentalist historicism that imbues modernization theory and orthodox Marxist approaches and that replicates the originary epistemic violence enacted by colonial pedagogy.

Yet, more often than not, this recognition of the limits of the specific epistemology of comparison associated with modernization theory and orthodox Marxism has taken the form of repudiating comparatist frameworks as such in favor of a focus on forms of heterogeneity that supposedly exceed modern representational frameworks. The seductive pull of Tagore's quarrel with "Europe," uncannily echoed in recent postcolonial iterations, stems from its chimerical promise of containing, indeed of bracketing, the multitemporal and multispatial dynamic of capitalism and the transformations wrought by colonialism. The impossibly overburdened category of "Europe" not only works as the site of this willed containment but propels the complementary move of positing an indigenous realm as a pure externality, a simple outside, to capitalist modernity. Yet claims of the existence of a privileged point outside, whether in the form of an inner spiritual sphere, untranslatable alterity, irreducible difference, or an "alternative modernity," unwittingly preserve, even as they attempt to overcome, the ideological coding of Euro-America as the hegemonic site of a noncontradictory and undifferentiated modernity.

It would seem, at first glance, that there is a determinate convergence in the epistemology of comparison that framed swadeshi nationalism and recent subalternist perspectives, a

convergence that goes beyond, for instance, their almost exclusively Bengal-centered and Bengali provenance. But the signification of autonomy in the early twentieth-century con- text of anticolonial struggles bears a deceptively isomorphic relationship to its contemporary status as an ontological claim about the singularity of colonial and postcolonial formations. Autonomy, during the swadeshi era in colonial India, signaled a collective political-economic and cultural project that sought to actualize the perceived organic character and imminent universality of indigenous practices and categories on the terrain of the everyday. Subalternist assertions of an alternative modernity, radical singularity, incommensurability, and the like bear an affective affiliation to this anticolonial struggle for autonomy.

But unmoored from a concretely political project, they elide a critical analysis of autonomy as a distinctive anticolonial project for an ontological claim about the presumed underdetermination of indigenous subjectivities and cultural forms. While these works might share the utopian surplus of swadeshi discourse, they also enact a willed forgetting of their own conditions of possibility. For what makes possible the long-run history of both projects and claims of radical autonomy and ideal-typical, teleological accounts of the replication of social and cultural forms is the historically specific dialectic between the universalizing drive of capitalism and the multiple forms of unevenness that are its internal supplement. While capitalism might have the determinate appearance-like a mirage-of constituting an "empty, homogenous time" and an "abstract homogenous space," it also contains within itself the principle of its own negation in the form of internal differentiation and fragmentation.

The problematic of unevenness-uneven development, the presence of contending temporalities and spaces, the lived "synchronicity of the nonsynchronous"- is a constitutive element of the doubled dynamic of capital and the phenomenological experience of modernity. Yet it also assumed an exaggerated form in colonial contexts, where the articulation of cultural and economic relations was overlaid, even overburdened, by the fractious interplay between received and transposed practices. This was

expressed in colonial India in the particular relationship between the state and the imperial economy, in the temporally accelerated articulation between novel and received forms and idioms, in the disjuncture between the space of the production of value and the space of its realization, and in the simultaneous homogenization and differentiation of socioeconomic relations on multiple spatiotemporal scales.

As a lived reality, colonial space-time was a multiply refracted force field. Its effects were manifest in the making of novel conceptions of space and time, in the radical re-signification of a range of locally inflected sociopolitical categories, in the forging of an insurgent nationalist political economy, and in the utopian amplitude of swadeshi visions of autonomy. We cannot assimilate the anticolonial project of autonomy to its postcolonial career as an ontological claim without performing another act of epistemic violence. The casualty in this instance of epistemic violence is not an imagined indigenous outside to modernity but the irreducibly material and global-in both its origin and scope-valence of the improvisational politics and thought that marked anticolonial struggles. I make this argument in two steps.

The first part of this essay explores the epistemological debates that have preoccupied studies of anticolonial nationalism. The second part elaborates the epistemology of comparison that defined the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century swadeshi nationalist project of autonomy and situates it within the lived experience of colonial unevenness. My analysis is motivated by the conviction that it is not enough to mark the inadequacy of conceptions of indigeneity as an external standpoint for the critique of modernity. Rather, the task concerns historicizing the emergence of indigenism, as a standpoint of critique and a self-understood insurgent idiom, and demonstrating its imminence within the contradictory structures and thought forms characteristic of a global, and profoundly uneven, modernity.

THE PROBLEMATIC OF ANTICOLONIAL NATIONALISM

Given the historical centrality of nationalism to the narrative of South Asian modernity, it is not surprising that it has been a

principal focus of particularly vexed epistemological questions about autonomy and comparability, difference and identity.

In his brilliant 1986 work, Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World, the subalternist theorist Partha Chatterjee lambasted both sociological determinist accounts of anticolonial nationalism as flawed replicas of European models and normatively conceived renderings of it as a dangerous problem in the world-at-large. Taking as his object of analysis the epistemological tensions of anticolonial nationalism, Chatterjee sought to explain how and why Indian nationalism legitimized its claims of cultural particularity within the terms of a universalistic post-Enlightenment discourse that was indissolubly tied to colonial domination.

From this perspective, in order for anticolonial nationalism to be authentically anticolonial, it would have had to liberate itself from post-Enlightenment rationalistic frameworks of thought or the "cunning of reason." Its relationship to colonial discourse would have had to take the form of a determinate negation. But therein lay the rub. Chatterjee argues in no uncertain terms that despite liberal-rationalist claims to the contrary, "the cunning of reason has not met its match in nationalism. On the contrary, it has seduced, apprehended and imprisoned it: this is what this book is about" (17).

Starting from this arresting, if politically bleak, premise, Chatterjee narrates the relationship between the colonial "cunning of reason" and nationalism as a tragedy in an almost classical sense. His analysis underscores the "fatal" failure of Indian nationalism in general and of such nationalists as Jawaharlal Nehru in particular to think beyond the horizon of colonial discourse. This failure is what Chatterjee calls the "blocked dialectic" between nationalism and colonialism (169). The indelible stain of colonial discourse imparted, he argues, a particular social and ideological cast to the transition from the colonial to the postcolonial national state in India. Indian nationalism sought the nationalization of the colonial state without attempting a substantive transformation of its administrative, juridical, and

institutional structure, and without mounting a radical challenge to existing class configurations.

While bourgeois nationalists, from Gandhi onward, found it necessary to mobilize the largest popular element of the colonized-the peasants-against the colonial state, they did so without handing over effective sovereignty to those in whose name they spoke. Thus, rather than establishing a form of universality grounded within the nationalpopular (i.e., the peasantry), the profoundly statist and reformist orientation of bourgeois Indian nationalism merely reproduced the global union between "Reason and capital" and authorized the continued marginalization of subaltern social groups in the postcolonial national era (168). Motivated by an acute unease with the inequities of the contemporary Indian nation-state, Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World is both an argument for and an example of a critical history of nationalism. There is, however, a central tension within Chatterjee's analysis of anticolonial nationalism.

On the one hand, he locates the contradictions of nationalism in terms of the hegemony of post-Enlightenment universalistic epistemologies that are seen as constitutive of colonial domination. Yet he criticizes specific nationalists for remaining within the hegemonic sway of colonial/post- Enlightenment discourse. Such a framework of analysis presupposes, without accounting for, the possibility that we can think ourselves outside of the dialectic of universality and particularity that structures the doubled character of the modern nation form.

By identifying the problem of nationalism only in terms of the formal constraints of its discursive content, Chatterjee overlooks the wider sociohistorical and historical-geographical contexts of its production. His reading of the "logical sequence in the evolution" of nationalism's "ideological structure" as moments within a "blocked dialectic" does not differentiate between a logical, deductive sense of necessity (e.g., certain premises have strict logical entailments) and a nondeterministic, historically specific conception of necessity (43). The problem, I suggest, consists in a one-sided formalistic reading of the tensions of anticolonial

nationalism. By analyzing the inner tensions of nationalism only in relation to a reified conception of post-Enlightenment epistemologies, his account ignores the ways in which both the emergence and the contradictions of nationalism were embedded within a specific sociohistorical configuration.

Such a narrowly discursivist reading ultimately renders arbitrary the internal tensions of nationalism. For they are conceived as a discursive effect of the hegemony of European/ colonial frameworks of thought rather than as socially embedded within the contradictions of the late colonial era. Chatterjee's later work, The Nation and Its Fragments, attempts to undo the theoretical impasse of the "blocked dialectic" between colonialism and nationalism that his prior work presented. In this work, Chatterjee locates the emergence of Indian nationalism within an autonomous "inner spiritual" realm that bears an ambiguous relationship at best to what he calls a "material" colonial domain.

The exact relationship between colonialism and nationalism is left ambiguous because there is a slippage between an ontological claim about the existence of separate material/colonial and spiritual/indigenous domains and an analysis of this opposition in terms of the conceptual idioms and performative self-fashioning of colonized elites against colonial rule. Whereas his first work on nationalism castigated Indian nationalists for remaining within the framework of colonial discourse, his second work posits a pure, autonomous, "spiritual" domain apparently untrammeled by colonialism and capitalism. Although this might appear to cleanse anticolonial nationalism from the stigmata of its derivative character as posited in his first work, it does so only at considerable conceptual expense. Chatterjee's second work tends to reify an indigenous domain as the repository of a pure difference. But there are good empirical and conceptual reasons to question the claim of a static and pure indigenous sphere untouched by colonial and capitalist transformations. Chatterjee's theory of anticolonial nationalism fails to take into account the qualitative reconstitutions of social practices during the late colonial era.

In Chatterjee's schema, however, lies the basis for a more historically specific approach to anticolonial nationalism. In a

striking passage, which contravenes the overarching thrust of his argument, he asserts that if "there is one great moment that turns the provincial thought of Europe to universal philosophy, the parochial history of Europe to universal history, it is the moment of capital-capital that is global in its territorial reach and universal in its conceptual domain." An acknowledgment of the imbrication of modes of colonial domination and forms of anticolonial nationalism within the global history of capitalism poses a major methodological challenge. This recognition would make it impossible to restrict analysis to discursive domains divorced from structuring social practices and socioinstitutional contexts. Chatterjee, however, only gestures toward this alternative approach; it does not inform his larger argument. Instead, his analysis tends toward an embrace of a particularistic difference (variously coded as an "inner sphere," "spiritual domain," and a logic of community grounded in the vernacular imagination of jati) conceived as outside the historically constituted field of colonial sociospatial relations.

Positioned against various modes of "elitist historiography" in the South Asian context and Eurocentric epistemologies in the Western academy, the subalternist project of rendering tangible the uneasy coexistence of forms of difference signals a political intervention in the field of knowledge production. Yet attention to historical and cultural particularity does not require the strong claim of a radical, pre-given, or static field of difference. In the last decade, there has been a discernible proliferation of claims of an incommensurable difference and radical singularity registered in the shifting categorical fortunes of the termsubaltern, which has long lost its initial Gramscian sociohistorical referent and increasingly stands in as a sign of untranslatable alterity and incommensurability as such. Yet such claims not only risk a general inaudibility in political terms but are ultimately unintelligible even to themselves. The notion of singularity is necessarily relational. It can mark the limits, within a particular intellectual and social field, of the intelligibility of specific concepts and tropological forms. But we cannot cognitively grasp, much less experience, singularity as such. The subaltern studies collective

has sought to revise "elitist historiography" from what Gyan Prakash has called the "place of 'otherness.' " Yet their positing of a privileged point outside has also led to an epistemological impasse of their own making.

The discourse-centered preoccupations of recent subalternist works are part of a wider shift within colonial studies away from an older fixation on uneven development, center-periphery relations, and the lived reality of material exploitation toward a focus on colonial dialogics, cultural hybridity, and symbolic politics. The recent course of colonial studies attests to the growing analytical dominance of what Jean and John Comaroff aptly name the "voice-over of a postcolonial discourse" that has been beset by the conviction that attention to large-scale socioeconomic processes and the material underpinnings of colonialism serves only to legitimate Euro-American imperial narratives. Against the representational glare of this discursivist turn, we need to reassert that a focus on the global historical-geography of capital does not require us to reify the economy, to treat it as an ontological given, as a self-regulating, autonomous sphere, or as determinative in some dreaded last instance.

The discrediting of the teleological and Eurocentric axioms of many iterations of dependency frameworks, world-systems theory, and orthodox Marxism need not sink us into the paradoxical predicament of excising the socioeconomic coordinates of colonialism. Such attempts not only fly in the face of the lived testimonies of anticolonial intellectuals and activists, but overlook the dialectical relationship between colonialism and capitalism as global social forms. They paradoxically have acquired ascendancy in a historical moment-saturated as it is by a global neoliberal order-that is uncannily similar to that of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century colonial era.

The making of a global space-time during this era was a dialectical, contradictory, and doubled process. It was generated by and expressive of the simultaneous deterritorialization (the acceleration of "space-time compression") and reterritorialization (the production of relatively fixed material infrastructures and

state forms that enable the accelerated circulation of capital) of multiple socioeconomic fields and cultural imaginaries. But the universalizing drive of capitalism succinctly expressed in Marx's statement that "the tendency to create the world market is directly given in the concept of capital itself" did not mean, either then or now, the realization of a unified and homogenous space-time. This was a consequence of both the internal contradictions within capitalism that impose structural limits on the homogeneity toward which the value form tends and the efficacy of historically diverse forms of resistance.

The constitution of a global space-time carries within itself the principle of its own negation. On the one hand, capital, as Marx argues, drives "beyond national barriers and prejudices as much as beyond nature worship, as well as all traditional, confined, complacent, encrusted satisfactions of present needs, and reproduction of old ways of life." Yet, as he continues, "from the fact that capital posits every such limit as a barrier and hence gets ideally beyond it, it does not by any means follow that it has really overcome it, and since every such barrier contradicts its character, its production moves in contradictions which are constantly overcome but just as constantly posited." The internal contradictions of capitalism, or the "barriers in its own nature," continually produce new forms of spatiotemporal difference. These forms of unevenness are "actively reconstituted features" rather than "historical residuals" of an anterior space-time.16 An emphasis on the production of an uneven global space-time enables us to foreground the historically doubled dynamic of capitalism without insisting on an absolute opposition between what Dipesh Chakrabarty names as "History 1" (universal logic of capital) and "History 2" (histories outside the logic of capital).

From this perspective, "History 2" represents an internal dimension of "History 1," not an absolute outside that episodically interrupts the supposedly homogenous, linear progression of an abstract logic of capital as such. We need, then, to distinguish between the inflated, utopian self-presentation of capital as abstract and homogenous and the contradictions internal to historical capitalism that produce a global, differentiated, and hierarchical

space-time. ''Provincializing'' Political Economy The broad contours of what was to remain the dominant nationalist argument against colonialism emerged during the 1870s and 1880s. It was during this historical conjuncture-marked by the intensification of colonial socioeconomic domination, devastating famines, deepening impoverishment, high inflation, and the sharpening of the lived unevenness of colonial space-time-that a distinctive political economy of nationhood was forged.

The formation of a strongly autarkic, idealist, and idealizing nationalist political economy-one that adopted and enriched the political signification of the central categories of the German historical school of political economy, especially the work of Friedrich List-constituted the positive content of the economic critique of colonialism and the normative basis for institutional nationalism (associated with the Indian National Congress). The authors of Indian economics, an anticolonial disciplinary formation rooted in the everyday experience of colonial unevenness, posited the nation as the natural scale of capital accumulation and the institutional means for overcoming the problem of colonial unevenness. They did so in and through an engagement with the problem of unevenness on multiple spatial scales and in different spheres.

Dadabhai Naoroji, among others, focused on the extractive relationship between Britain and India (one commonly figured as that between bloated city and bleeding countryside).

The celebrated ''drain thesis''-the foundational category of the economic critique of colonialism-inverted the claims of progress generated by the colonial state and provided such positivist indices as national per capita income estimates in order to render palpable the impoverishment of what was seen as a bounded national space and economy.18 M. G. Ranade, and later G. V. Joshi and Vaman Kale, analyzed the generation of ''dependent'' colonial economies in relation to the international division of labor that underwrote relations of unequal exchange in terms that contested and exceeded the axiomatic presuppositions of classical political economy.19 Others, such as Radhakamal Mukherjee and Romesh Dutt, directed attention to the deepening internal differentiation of the imagined nation evinced in the violent articulation of local economies with the world market, accelerated urban-rural polarization, the reified separation between intellectual and manual labor, and the toll wrought by recurrent devastating famines.

In their attempt to envision a nationalist and historicist political economy against the abstractions of classical political economy and the contradictions of colonial space, they proffered a concretely political and strongly autarkic vision of the nation as the natural scale of capital accumulation and as the collective embodiment of indigenous labor. They also explicitly thematized the intrinsic links between the epistemological coordinates of classical political economy and of colonial rule. For one of the self-assigned burdens of Indian economics, taken up with particular fervor during the swadeshi era, was the formulation of a framework adequate to the perceived inner dynamic of indigenous social institutions and practices. The swadeshi intellectual and activist Mukherjee provided one of the strongest articulations of this project in his magisterial study entitled The Foundations of Indian Economics (1916).

His analysis-from the violence intrinsic to exchange relations, the positing of village-communities as the normative exemplar for a national economic space, and the emphasis on decentralized institutions of political and economic governance-prefigured the conceptual armature of Gandhi's critique of modernity. The specific burden of Indian economics-articulated in the idealist inflection of the swadeshi era-resided in the selective appropriation of modern economic institutions toward the ''expression of the Indian genius, of the particular phase of universal humanity which the Indian people are unfolding'' (FIE, 9). Writing with a profound sense of urgency, Mukherjee held up contemporary village communities as the archetypical casualty of colonial development.

The ''great economic revolution'' wrought by colonial spatial-economic restructuring was nowhere more apparent than in the intensified differentiation, the spectacular ''contrast between city life and village life'' (FIE, 5). Although it was ''still almost self-

sufficing . . . as an economic unit'' (FIE, 3), the village was rapidly assuming its assigned status in the dominant ''system of production'' as merely a ''field of exploitation'' with no ''separate existence of its own'' (FIE, 402). The fate of the village community was, for Mukherjee, exemplary of the constitutive inequalities intrinsic to ''a system of production [where] the worker is a mere servant to machinery'' such that in the corresponding ''system of social organization the village'' could exist only as ''a slave of the city'' (FIE, 402). His account of the rapid evisceration of the autonomy of village communities, their formal subsumption within the urbancentered logic of colonial state space, resonates with theories of uneven development formulated during the 1930s and 1940s from outside ''Euro- America,'' from the Japanese Marxist Kozo Uno to the more well-known tradition of Chinese Maoism.

The convergence on the problematic of urbanrural differentiation expressed the historical and experiential specificity of colonized, semicolonial, and so-called late-industrializing social formations. Whereas Naoroji's neomercantilist drain thesis had focused on modalities of financial domination in the sphere of circulation and between Britain and ''India,'' Mukherjee broadened the drain thesis to emphasize the ''drain from the village to the city'' of ''all skill, enterprise, knowledge and wealth'' in the sphere of production and within the imagined national economic space (FIE, 415). This intranational drain was producing a highly differentiated economic and social space evinced in intensified rural migration, the exponential growth of landless classes, and the flight of the ''natural guardians, the [rural] middle class,'' from villages to cities in order to find employment in an ''unfruitful'' and unproductive colonial sphere (FIE, 415).

For Mukherjee, the internal drain was part of the social process of reification constitutive of modernity itself, that is, the ''separation between village and city, the laborer and the employer, the specialist and layman, the multitude and the genius, the brain worker and the manual laborer'' (FIE, 449).

While such differentiations were intrinsic to the dominant ''system of production,'' the violent agency of colonialism had

ensured an especially painful articulation of village communities bathed, in Mukherjee's work, in an eternal present of custom and endogenous reproduction with the concentrated and accelerated time of the world market (FIE, 5).

Although Mukherjee's analysis emphasized the historical production of forms of unevenness on multiple scales (urban/ rural; metropole/ colony) and spheres (intellectual versus manual labor), it also simultaneously sought to recover a self-sufficient, self-moving village economy based on cooperative principles and a regulated hierarchy of social differences based on ''caste, jati'' (FIE, 464). His emphasis on the village as the normative model for an Indian national economy prefigured Gandhi's anxiety that under the sway of modern national developmentalism the imagined village economy and community would become a permanent subaltern remainder in the anticipated national state. Both Mukherjee and Gandhi regarded village communities as the principal casualties of colonial capitalism and rejected urban-centered national industrialization on that basis. Yet, the precise spatiotemporal referent and meaning of villages was, then as now, a contested question.

There was a decided oscillation in this strand of nationalist economic thought and practice between a vision of village communities as a reservoir of indigenous institutions that had to be restored and/or preserved wholesale and a more futurist attempt that sought their transformation, that imagined villages of the future in the present. Mukherjee, like many other swadeshists, established a range of cooperative enterprises in rural Bengal. These enterprises sought to foster autonomous village economies oriented toward an anticipated national space devoid of internal differentiations and inequalities. Yet the futurity of such projects coexisted with practices that reactivated the disciplinary and scopic regime which marked and made the everyday experience of caste-as-lived. Mukherjee insisted that the ''joint-Hindu family and caste or jati '' were and should remain the ''ethical and social basal factors'' of an Indian economy and society, and he characterized his own institutional experiments as exemplary in this regard (FIE, 464). The deeply troubled

implications of this vision lay not only in its attempted transformation, to borrow a phrase from Theodor Adorno, of a "bad empirical reality into transcendence" but in its endorsement of an upper-caste Hindu ideology as the normative content of an autonomous national space and economy.

Yet, at the same moment, the attempt to fashion a nationalist political economy attentive to indigenous institutions represented a sharp riposte to Eurocentric frameworks that homogenized and repressed forms of historical difference. Mukherjee unequivocally characterized dominant theories of "social evolution," as elaborated by "Western sociologists," as "essentially false" (FIE, 328). At issue, for him, was not only the deployment of an "abstract and arbitrary standard deduced from the evolution of Western civilization" in order "to judge the progress of different peoples" (FIE, 328).

The problem concerned the ideological moorings of theories of social evolution. For Mukherjee, there was little doubt that social evolutionary perspectives were direct expressions, the normative ballast, of European colonialism. He specifically identified theories that "regarded the Hebraic- Graeco-Romano-Gothic civilization as representing the culmination of cultural progress" and construed "the eastern types of culture as if they were either monstrous or defective forms of life, or only primitive ancestral forms, the earlier steps of the series that have found their completion in European society and civilization" as the ideological scaffolding of colonial domination (FIE, 328).

Drawing on the work of the Hegelian philosopher Brajendranath Seal, Mukherjee prefigured key themes of contemporary colonial historiography and postcolonial theory-the intimacy between colonial power/ knowledge, the ideological moorings of teleological assumptions, the denial of coevalness and the like-by over half a century. It was, he proclaimed, a "gross and stupid blunder" not only to link "Chinese, Hindu, Semitic, Greek, Roman, Gothic, Teutonic in one line of filiations" but to "reduce each living procession to a punctual moment in a single line" (FIE, 329). For "universal humanity" could not be "figured" as "occupying but one place at any moment and leaving all behind

at a dead level," but rather was "immanent everywhere and at every moment" (FIE, 329).

The insurgent field of Indian economics rejected the territorialization of modernity in specific regions by directing attention instead to what Mukherjee called the "multiform geographical and historical conditions" that underwrote a single yet internally differentiated global formation (FIE, 329). The critique of dominant evolutionary frameworks stemmed, in part, from a recognition of the concrete multiplicity of differential and contending times and spaces that coexisted and constituted a global space-time. But rather than simply affirming or celebrating a particularistic difference as such, nationalists sought the actualization of the universalistic promise of development and the realization of forms of universality rooted in the particularity of indigenous institutions. Grounded in social categories of the universal (capital, economy, state), nationalism couched its very claims to autonomy in a self-consciously modernist idiom. If the project of Indian economics was a product of the lived contradictions of colonial space, it was also inseparably part of the transnational ascendancy of statist developmentalist frameworks in the late nineteenth century.

These presented a profound challenge to the political-economic imaginary and regulatory order that underwrote Britain's globe-spanning imperial economy. The promise of state-directed economic development conjured by the German Historical School and by List was explicitly intended for aspiring imperial powers ("civilized nations" such as Germany and the United States) suffering under the perceived dual yoke of classical political economy and Britain's global economic hegemony. Indian nationalists, especially swadeshi activists, did more than simply extend the categories of Listian developmentalism and the German Historical School beyond the Atlantic circuit of its initial formulation. By reworking the problem of autonomy and development with specific reference to colonial unevenness, they radicalized its political signification, deepened its social reference, and transformed the "original" in turn. Listian developmentalism as recast in a range of colonial and peripheral contexts-from late

nineteenth-century India to twentieth-century Korea and Kemalist Turkey-had a socially radical afterlife outside its original constituency precisely because of its articulation with distinctive forms of spatial unevenness and experiences of temporal nonsynchronicity.

Ironically, an exploration of the insurgent nationalist political economy forged by Indian nationalists returns to focus the now-forgotten origins of the term postcolonial. The term was first employed in the context of debates about modes of articulation and state forms in South Asian political economy of the early 1970s.23 This is ironic in light of not only the decline of political economy in South Asian historiography and colonial studies more generally but the prevalent epistemological and discourse-centered preoccupations of postcolonial theory. This is a point not just about the speci- ficity of anticolonial significations of autonomy but about the dangers of eclipsing from view the profound rupture from the anticolonial that the contemporary valence of postcolonialism represents.

PURSUING AUTONOMY

The nationalist critique of colonialism shaped, in a relation of reciprocal determination, the turn-of-the-century swadeshi movement. Swadeshi practices such as the boycott of British products, the fostering of indigenous capital and enterprise, the valorization of a productive, self-sacrificing laboring subject as the normative national, the institution of a range of nationalist cultural and social organizations, and the like sought to secure the autonomy of the imagined nation. Within the more abstract argot of nationalist political economy, autonomy had signaled a modern developmentalist project grounded in conceptions of the nation as the natural scale of capital accumulation.

The meaning of autonomy, as recast by swadeshi activists and intellectuals, came to occupy a more expansive semantic and social field. Autonomy entailed the actualization in everyday practices of the presumed organic character and universal logic of indigenous practices, institutions, and categories of understanding.

The central task concerned concretizing, in the here and now, what Tagore, the poet-philosopher of the movement in its initial phase, called a "swadeshi samaj," or an autonomous society constituted through collective and individual practices of self-reliance, self-sufficiency, and sacrifice. In a famous July 1904 public address, "Our Swadeshi Samaj," Tagore elaborated the lineaments of an ethics of indigeneity that shaped the everyday politics of the swadeshi movement. Key elements of this vision included the organization of cooperative enterprises, the critique of consumption practices, the emphasis on labor practices oriented toward the accumulation of spiritual and material shakti (power), the forging of rural grass-roots development projects, and mass education schemes through received folk media. While Tagore would later become one of the most committed critics of nationalism as such, and would especially abjure the exclusionary Hindu underpinnings of dominant nationalism, there was in this early moment no hesitation about proclaiming that the "common ground" for the envisioned swadeshi samaj would "not be un-Hindu, it will be more especially Hindu" (GI, 32).

It was precisely the perceived humanist kernel of Hinduism that would "unite us in concrete relations with this Bharatvarsha of ours, the resort of our gods, the retreat of our rishis [Hindu sages], the motherland of our ancestors" (GI, 21). The establishment of early colonial rule had, he noted, coincided with the protracted loss of Bharat's former glory marked by a resistance to novelty, the substitution of a "womanish shakti of thrift and conservation" for a "masculine adventurous curiosity" (GI, 29), and a pervasive succumbing to a "policy of funk" (GI, 31).

Tagore observed, "At his onslaught [of the Britisher] the defensive barriers of our crouching, run-away samaj [society] began to give way in places, and through the gaps the Outside, in dread of which we had shrunk into ourselves, came hurtling in upon us. Now who shall thrust it back? With this breaking down of our enclosure we discovered two things-how wonderfully strong we had been, how miserably weak we have become" (GI, 30). Collective acts of sacrifice, likened to the "vast Yajnas" (Vedic ritual sacrifices) of "old days" (GI, 19), would work as a national

barricade against the "fatal embrace" of colonial domination that had "introduced its tentacles through and through our social fabric, from our educational institutions to the shops dealing with our daily necessities" (GI, 23). The adoption of renunciatory practices conjoined with a productivist ethic would constitute the specifically swadeshi strategy for national material and spiritual accumulation. Such efforts would gather the fragmented energies of what had become a "broken-up samaj" (GI, 20) and unleash the "undying shakti [power] of Bharat" (GI, 32).

The swadeshi movement did not represent a retreat from or of the political. It contested both the narrow institutional understanding of politics and the formalistic conception of rights enshrined in classical liberalism and permanently deferred in a colonial state. What it rejected outright was the relegation of the political to the "speechifying" sanctified precincts of the Indian National Congress, what Tagore called the "book-learned . . . watchand- chain-bedecked assembly" (GI, 19). It was precisely because the colonial state had no organic affiliation with indigenous society that attempts to seek transformations in state policy entailed only the successive loss of autonomy-"the government in our country, the Sarkar, has no relations with our social organizations, the Samaj, so that whatever we may seek from the former must be paid for out of our freedom" (GI, 6). The reformist, state-centered orientation of institutional nationalism simply affirmed the intimacy between a neglect of the inner logic of indigenous institutions and the condition of bondage.

For as Tagore suggested, "have we not signed away our birthright to the white man-are not our very tastes put for sale in his shops?" (GI, 8). Swadeshi samaj was envisioned as at once a space of refuge from an increasingly interventionist colonial state, a site of resistance to the further loss of the distinctive destiny, the "God-given function of India," and a space for redeeming the inner logic of indigenous institutions and practices (GI, 32). The practical activity of establishing substantive autonomy required nothing more, and nothing less, than becoming "our true selves, consciously, actively and with our full strength (shakti)" (GI, 31). One of the most commonly invoked examples of an

organic national society and economy within swadeshi discourse was Japan. Within the geopolitical imaginary of swadeshi, Japan occupied, especially after its victory over Russia in 1905, a central normative significance. It figured prominently-in economic, philosophical, and literary texts; folksongs; and popular discourse-as an example of a society that had achieved capitalist development without surrendering its unique cultural essence and autonomy.

Tagore held up Japan as an archetypical instance of a nation that had resisted the totalizing sway of a formal, instrumental rationality that ceaselessly converted the other into the same, transformed organic relations into a mechanical social cement, and attenuated the individual into "a machine, a tool, for the furtherance of some interest" (GI, 16). While Japan's victory had been waged through the "mechanical" means of war, its nationals had not become "parts of a machine," for "every Japanese solider was something more than a machine . . . they all remained related to their Mikado and their country in a reverential self-dedication" (GI, 16). Japan's "efficient modern war" did not translate into a battlefield peopled by automatons blindly fulfilling an imposed logic and going to "their death like pawns moved by an unknown player." The instrumental, life-destroying, and mechanical orientation of an alien and alienating colonial modernity could be overcome only through a willed embrace of the animating sociocultural spirit common to both Japan and Bharat, namely that of "sacrifice" and "selfimmolation" (GI, 17).

In his post-swadeshi liberal internationalist incarnation, Tagore would rethink this fantastic misrecognition of Japan's imperial war machine and emergent fascist ideologies of a homogenous national-social body. During his travels to Southeast Asia, China, Japan, and the United States in 1916- 17, he emphasized the complex imbrication of self-understood antihegemonic nationalisms within the alienating structures of modernity. Driven by a "desire to turn themselves into a machine of power" (N, 39) in a world-historical context defined by the proliferation of "national carnivals of materialism" (N, 141), Japan was for Tagore only one more instance of the disastrous "logic of the Nation" (N, 60). Instead of the embodiment of organic solidarity or genuine

autonomy, Japanese society stood for an ''allpervading mental slavery'' (N, 39) manifest in the ''voluntary submission of the whole people'' to the ''clipping of their freedom by their government'' (N, 141).

In a controversial public address in Tokyo, he argued that the hegemonic aspirations of the Japanese national-imperial project rested on a doubled conflation of modernization (capitalist development) with modernism and Europe. Its ''modernizing'' (N, 93) ambitions represented the substitution of a genuine modernism of autonomous thought and action with a project of mere ''mimicry,'' one that was ''louder'' and more ''literal'' than the original (N, 94). While Japanese newspapers praised the ''poetic qualities'' of this address, they also relegated it, as Tagore ruefully observed, to the ''poetry of a defeated people'' (N, 53).

The self-conscious celebration of the subject-position of those without a nation, the valorization of the special destiny of ''we of no nations of the world,'' was, unlike the Swadeshi Samaj address of 1904, explicitly antinationalist (N, 60). From this standpoint, the nation form was both an expression and product of the abstract structure of capitalist modernity that everywhere ''turned souls into commodities and life into compartments, which, with its iron claws, scratches out the heart of the world and knows not what it has done.'' The consolidation of the nation form, the ''advent'' of more ''people into the arena of nationality'' (N, 54), only increased the numbers of ''bond-slaves'' of a globe-spanning and mechanistic capitalist modernity (N, 60).

Tagore's critique of the exclusionary ''civilization of power'' instantiated in the nation form carried a distinctively utopian imprimatur (N, 33). In this regard, Tagore's early swadeshi formulations of autonomy and his subsequent antinationalist liberal humanism were both steeped in a resolutely utopian understanding of collective and individual practices of autonomy. However, the politics of autonomy as enshrined in dominant swadeshi practice and discourse, from which Tagore decisively broke by 1907, was more firmly rooted within an avowedly nativist and nationalist episteme. It was during the swadeshi era that

radical nationalists recast the notion of Bharat Mata (Mother India) in an explicitly idealist philosophical framework, one whose underlying epistemology of comparison bears an uncanny resemblance to contemporary theorizations of difference. From the 1870s onward, conceptions of Bharat Mata in popular geo-historical discourse had borne an unmarked relationship to everyday Hindu devotional practices.

It was swadeshi activists such as Bipin Pal and Aurobindo Ghose who self-consciously elaborated its meaning in idealizing and idealist terms, welding together upper-caste Hindu philosophical traditions of thought and popular Shakta devotional practices. Within the terms of this high philosophical nativist discourse, Bharat Mata was posited as an archaic spiritual essence, a transcendent ''regulative Idea of the universe,'' expressive of the universality of Hinduism and Indian nationhood.24 While conceding the formal similarity between notions of Bharat Mata and contemporary German nationalist notions of the ''Fatherland'' and older European notions of ''patrie,'' Pal insisted that the ''nation as mother,'' as ''applied to India by its children,'' was radically distinct in substance and could not, therefore, be grasped with reference to European concepts and histories (Soul, 83). What distinguished the Indian concept of nation-as-mother from apparently similar European formations was that it ''had no metaphor behind it.''

It was not a ''mere idea or fancy'' (Soul, 84), nor could it be reduced to the ''mere civic sentiment'' that underwrote what he called the ''secular patriotism of Europe'' (Soul, 108). Yet, despite this strong assertion of radical difference, Pal invoked Giuseppe Mazzini's definition of nationality as the ''individuality of peoples'' to suggest a singular self-conscious being or personality particular to every national formation (Soul, 94). In other words, a singular selfconscious being marks out ''different human units from one another,'' and, on a global scale, ''this differentiation between the collective life and character of different social units constitutes the very soul and essence of the nation idea.''25 The ''mother'' in ''motherland'' was such a ''distinct personality,'' in the specifically Hegelian sense of a conscious, self-mediating Spirit that evolves

through a succession of its temporal forms toward absolute knowledge of itself and that was conceived by "the Hindu . . . [as] behind his own history and evolution" (Soul, 94). As a lived actuality rather than a conceptual abstraction, Bharat Mata was at once a "physical and spiritual, geographical and social" entity, and what is more, the "cult of the Mother among us . . . our love of the land and people" was an "organic part of our ideal of the love of God" (Soul, 108).

The concept of Bharat Mata was rooted, according to Pal, within the "old universal" (Soul, 87) principles constitutive of all systems of Hindu- Brahminical philosophical thought: the structuring dynamic of Purusha (the principle of change coded as a masculine essence) and Prakriti (the principle of permanence coded as feminized nature or earth) (Soul, 88).

The relationship between these two principles was, for Pal, that of a fundamental unity of opposites that structured in common the otherwise distinct Vedantic, Vaishnava, and Shaivite traditions. The conception of mother "asso- ciated with our geographical habitat," that is, the "Personality behind [Hindu] history and evolution," represented Prakriti as Shakti (primordial, universal power) (Soul, 88).

Drawing a parallel between Hegel's conception of the unfolding of reason as one where "the self separates itself from itself to return to itself to be itself," Pal suggests that Bharat Mata, the embodiment of Prakriti, was "that through which the Divine realizes Himself in His Own Being" (Soul, 89).

Pal transposed Hegel's idea of the Absolute as the subject-object of history unto nation-as-mother, which was identified as the "dynamic element in our ethical consciousness . . . as providence in history . . . as that which works out different changes through which the universe is evolving itself. . . . It is Raciality in the history and evolution of races. It is the spirit of Nationality in national life and evolution" (Soul, 92).

Pal insisted that the conception of Bharat Mata was not, as Britishcolonial ideology averred, a "rank superstition" or "sinister fanaticism" (Soul, 106-7). Nor was it an instance of what Hegel called a "Pure Being," equivalent to a "Pure Nothing," which severed from the particular remains an empty abstraction. Quite the converse; Bharat Mata embodied, for Pal, the fact that the "universal cannot exist without the particular" (Soul, 94).

Unlike the "worldly, merely political aspirations" of European nationalism that could not grasp the unity of the universal and the particular, and consequently could never attain "the dignity of a philosophy, or the sanctity of religion," the Indian concept of nation-as-mother was a lived actuality, one that was at once universal and particular, abstract and concrete. More crucially, it was a constitutive element of the phenomenology of Hinduism-as-lived, of the performative logic of everyday Hindu devotional practices.

Tied to the "peculiarly Hindu conception of the Motherhood of God," it was continually enacted in the "concrete experiences of motherhood in our own mothers first, dimly, as through a glass, and next in the motherhood of our own wives . . . that we can see and seize the Motherhood of God" (Soul, 107).

Given this dense philosophical-religious referential context, it was not surprising, Pal argued, that "outsiders" who know Bharat Mata only as India could apprehend her only as "a mere bit of earth . . . as only a geographical expression" (Soul, 106). It was "absolutely impossible for the European or American to clearly understand . . . this strange idealization of our land . . . the Cult of the Mother among us" (Soul, 107).

Pal acknowledged the novelty of the constellation of nation and mother, the fact that it was only in recent decades that "all these old and traditional gods and goddesses who had lost their hold upon the modern educated mind have been reinstalled with new historic and nationalist interpretations in the thoughts and sentiments of the people" (Soul, 105). Yet he nonetheless presented his project as the recovery of the original pure meaning of Bharat Mata.

In a move paradigmatic of modern idealist and nativist projects that slide from a critique of the present to a promised escape from history as such, Pal sought to endow the concept of Bharat Mata

with a transcendent meaning by retrieving its original, and therefore final, reference.

The generalization of Bharat Mata in repertoires of mass mobilization had, he argued, resulted in the denudation of its original meaning as the "idealization and spiritualization of the collective life and functions of our society . . . as the apotheosis of our Race-Spirit and National Organism" (Soul, 109).

Against this debasement of Bharat Mata born of the "imitation of foreign ideas and ideals" and the "uncritical study of European histories and concepts," Pal strained to redeem its auratic value (Soul, 109). He attempted to secure for his fellow nationals-especially "modern educated" members of the Hindu middle classes, whom colonialism had severed from the "ancient realities of their language and literature"-the ultimate guarantee of the organic and the originary (Soul, 83).

Yet such an attempt only reinforced the status of Bharat Mata as exemplary of "frozen emanations," namely, words "that are sacred without sacred content."26 For one of the constitutive contradictions of the "jargon of authenticity" and other cognate projects of modernist reenchantment is that they gather force precisely with the disintegration of auratic values and meanings in everyday life.

The swadeshi-era signification of Hinduism as a "unique Universality" anchored the claim that the immediate particularity of Indian society was sublated by a deeper, fundamental universality. Indian nationhood was therefore not a particularistic concern but rather in the very interest of "Universal Humanity." By this same logic, a Bharat or India foreign to itself, as was the case under colonial rule, was the very sign of alienated humanity. While this line of reasoning shaped the persistently universalistic self-understanding of swadeshi nationalism, it neither did nor could smooth over its multiple internal contradictions.

One of the deep tensions within the swadeshi political-economic imaginary was that the productivist economic strategies advanced threatened to undermine the assumed "synthetic" and organic character of the Indian nation. On the one hand, nationalists

pitted the assumed "synthetic" organic unity of indigenous institutions against the "analytical, mechano-centric" character of Western society (FIE, 463).

This fissure parallels the specifically modern binarism between Gemeinschaft/ Gesellschaft-the traditional, organically linked community versus the alienated society engendered by the dissolution of all organic links. On the other hand, nationalists sought capitalism without Gesellschaft, industrial development without the attendant structural tensions.

The constitutive elements of Indian nationalism-the nativist envisioning of Bharat as an organic national whole; the tension between a universalistic conception of development and a particularistic vision of nationhood; the swadeshi-born faith in forging a uniquely pacific path of industrialization that would yield capitalist development without Gesellschaft- were expressed and shaped through particular cultural and social logics and categories of understanding. Yet Indian nationalism was not a singular formation set apart from the global field of its emergence and constitution.

The attempt to secure an alternative gestalt grounded in the assumed singularity of indigenous institutions and practices was a historically determinate response to the perceived abstract and deterritorializing dynamic of capitalism. The idea of nationhood as the culmination of an inner dialectic, as an organic formation, had become a key motif of late nineteenthand early twentieth-century nationalist discourse across diverse regional contexts.

Confronted with the convulsive transformations wrought by colonialism and capitalism, many nationalists in colonial India, as elsewhere, translated the historical dislocations of the present in and through a nativist, historicist, and idealist categorical idiom.

There may well be, as David Harvey argues, "no outer resolution to the inner contradictions of capitalism," no stable institutional and spatial fix to the contradictions that have shaped its dynamic historical geography apart from a thoroughgoing

internal transformation.28 Yet, in a specific historical conjuncture and global field, the nation form came to represent for many anticolonial activists in South Asia, as elsewhere, the embodiment of a form of universality grounded in particularity, of sustained economic growth, and the institutional medium for either resolving or regulating socioeconomic unevenness. In our current historical moment, the spectral gathering of imperial projects, revisionist apologias for empire, and the proximate after effects of neoliberal restructuring threatens to bludgeon the critical legacy of anticolonial struggles.

Indian nationalists, like many anticolonial activists in East Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, had sought to realize the dream of autonomy, to overcome what Gandhi called the khudaro, or barbarism, of colonialism and capitalism, to achieve a substantively noncolonial future.We know all too well, of course, the shattering of this promise by both internal tensions and external constraints, of the transformation of utopian visions into legitimating ones, of the hollowing out of the radically futural impulse of diverse anticolonial imaginaries.

Yet anticolonial movements- from the Haitian revolution of the 1790s to the twentieth-century era of decolonization to the nonaligned movement that transposed swadeshi's vision of autonomy unto a wider geopolitical field-did secure the right of collective self-determination, if only in a formal sense, beyond the particular regions of Europe and America.

The proximate conjunction between imperial projects and neoliberal economic fatalism seems poised to render debates on ''postcoloniality,'' especially those that bracket political economy, ever more scholastic. The point here is not to embrace an uncritical view of anticolonial struggles; rather, it is the importance of not confining our analysis to what Adorno identified as the historicist underpinnings of the ''loathsome question'' of what is ''living and what is dead'' about past works and struggles, of their meaning for the present.29 We might ask instead the antihistoricist question of what our shared neoliberal global present signifies from the standpoint of anticolonial struggles for autonomy.

A NOTE OF THE EXPRESSION 'INDIAN RENAISSANCE'

The expression 'Indian Renaissance' is, in my opinion, a misnomer. I further submit that its continued use has misled our thinking. I do not know who was the first person, Indian or possibly European, to coin this expression. Whoever the person may have been, it is obvious that the choice of the expression is based on some kind of analogy.

What the Renaissance is to the history of Europe, namely, an ushering in of the Modern Age in succession to the Middle Ages, so be the Indian Renaissance to the history of India, namely, an ushering in of the Modern Age in succession to the Indian Middle Ages. Now up to a point in the perspective of World History of which the history of the Indian Civilization, of the cultural zone of South Asia is a past, this line of reasoning makes sense - with the reservation that some thinkers have placed the beginning of the Modern Age in South Asia to the coming of the Mughal dynasty to the North and the coming of the Portuguese to the South.

Justice M.G. Ranado even, went to the length of likening the bhakti movement to the Protestant Reformation. Now without looking deeper into the historical issues, I should at the same time like to point out that there is some need to identify what is meant by the ethos of Medieval Europe and the ethos of Renaissance Europe before the issue of motivating factors and their effects could be taken up.

Medieval Europe can be identified with a feudal social order, a Church-dominated cultural order, and a personality directed by the Other (whether the expression 'the Other' can be understood in its widest sense). In contrast to this Medieval ethos we can set up another abstraction, namely, the Renaissance ethos. Renaissance Europe can be identified with a mercantile social order, a history-oriented cultural order, and a personality directed by a search for a new order. (The Protestant Reformation is simply a part of the Renaissance).

Now, what do we find when we turn to the nineteenth-century Indian resurgence that we associate with names like Rama

Mohan Roy and M.G. Ranade? To begin with, it is fragmented by religion (e.g. the Muslims and professionals drawn into it), by classes (e.g. the scholars and professionals were only imperfectly in touch with the new merchants like Jagannath Shankarsheth and merchant -industrialists like Jamshedji Tata and with the peasant discontent), by region (e.g. in spite of being a seat of the East India rule and of one of the oldest universities, Madras did not figure as a Renaissance Centre along with Bombay and Calcutta).

Next, it is not all-pervasive: it is interesting that Marx did not reach the Indian intellectuals till the beginning of the twentieth-century, that while literature, the theatre, and the visual arts were affected by the new ethos, music and dance were left severely alone, and that the critique of religion was not followed up by the emergence of a new philosophy.

Finally, the Renaissance man was largely conspicuous by his absence. The nearest we come to personalities touching upon many sides of life are Justice Ranade, economist, historian, statesman, religious and social reformer; Rabindranath Tagore, poet, painter, a thinker and founder of Visvabharati and Sriniketan; and Mahatma Gandhi, political and social activist, religious and economic critic. One has only to look at these names and the impact of those personalities and to compare these names with Indian on the scene to realize that the so-called Indian Renaissance is a far cry from the European Renaissance.

To conclude, we certainly need a handy designation for the historical episode. But the choice of the expression 'Indian Renaissance' is not apposite. If we have to think of it as an analogue to a European historical episode, then the European Enlightenment comes much nearer to the ethos of the Indian movement. In Marathi I much prefer the expression used by D.K. Bodekar, namely, Bharatiya prabodhan.

Actually, the gap between the label 'Indian Renaissance' and the reality is a case of a tragic failure on the part of Indians to take their future in their own hands. (Parenthetically, I should like to point out that the debacle of post-Independence India is in part

traceable to this failure. Any rectification of the contemporary failure has to being with a critique of the Indian Prabodhan.) The continued use of the misnomer makes us blind to the basic failure of the Indian Prabodhan.

It is time that we rid ourselves of this blind spot if not of the misnomer that protects that blind spot. The massive survival of the Feudalistic attitude and tactics is an example of the failure in modernizing India.

Postscript : Etymologically of course the Renaissance was the revival of Greek learning. (The Indian Prabodhan did have its small share of rediscovery of the Sanskrit classics like Bhavabhuti and Kautilya in addition to the tradition canon.)

The Indian Prabodhan (that is, teaching and awakening) did not stand for the revival of the past but for the regeneration of the Indian society by the assimilation of western values and the rediscovery of Indian values of the distant past rather than the immediate medieval past.

THE IDEA OF SVARAJ

Krishna Chandra Bhattacharya's discourse "Svaraj in ideas" is as relevant today after more than fifty years as it was relevant when it was delivered around 1928-30 at a time when India was still about twenty years away from the goal of political Svaraj. Its current relevance redounds greatly to its author's credit (combining as it does an impassioned plea with keen analysis), but, what is more to the point, also to the discredit and shame of contemporary Indians.*

More than three decades of political independence have not seen us even substantially nearer the goal of Svaraj in ideas. In all conscience the discourse by Bhattacharya should have become by now only a document of successful struggle for that second Svaraj.

A reconsideration of the discourse is certainly welcome therefore, but the occasion should not be permitted to degenerate into one of collective breast-beating or one of a rehash of the latest slogan of "ideational decolonization" currently fashionable in the

West or, more insidiously, one of pleading for "Svadeshi in ideas". Though "Svadeshi in ideas" was far from the author's intention, there is a real danger of that sort of misreading of Bhattacharya's discourse - not because the author is in any way unclear or ambiguous on the point but because the misreading is an easy way out for the tired mind or the lethargic mind.

What I propose to do on this occasion is two things, namely, first, to block the way to the misreading, and, secondly, to consider the circumstances that led to the situation lamented by Bhattacharya and to the lamentable continuance of that situation. But let us first present Bhattacharya's argument (as far as possible, using his own phraseology). This would also help me to set out more clearly the points on which I have some reservations about that argument.

(1) The domain of ideas is the conscious level of operation of culture. So any consideration of culture processes is also applicable to processes that have to do with ideas. (Bhattacharya nowhere says this in so many words, but it is an obvious presupposition underlying his argument.)

(2) Cultural assimilation is acceptance of alien ideas in place of (or in addition to) indigenous ideas as a result of conscious and free choice. This process is typically accompanied by critical sifting and fair competition between the alien and the indigenous.

(3) Cultural subjection is submission to alien ideas without any critical engagement either with the alien ideas being accepted or with the indigenous ideas that are being replaced. This process is typically unconscious.

(4) Cultural self-determination is more than a desirable goal- it is the natural condition of a community in a state of health. Its absence or loss is life-harming not only to the community but also to the very soul of its members.

(5) Cultural assimilation is compatible with cultural self-determination; indeed in a given case it may assist progress. Cultural subjection is the antithesis of cultural self-determination and therefore an evil, especially when, in its acute form, there is even no consciousness of the restraint on freedom.

(6) An initial resistance to alien ideas is natural and even a healthy defence against cultural subjection. One associates such resistance with folk wisdom. (Bhattacharya perhaps should have explicitly added : The initial resistance should remain initial, a symptom of critical reserve and not a symptom of blind rejection of the alien.)

So much for Bhattacharya' controlling ideas. It may be noted by way of a historical footnote that these ideas of his seem to be a reflex of the anti-Benthamite, idealistic trend of European thought and thus an instance of healthy cultural assimilation on the part of Bhattacharya. As assimilated alien ideas they get linked up in his mind with the indigenous idea underlying the Sanskrit adage about svadharma and paradharma.

Now let us see how he brings these controlling ideas to bear on India under British domination. He accepts the received division of that society into "our educated men" (cultural élite in today's women.) The cultural élite are usually further divided into the conservatives or revivalists on the one hand (the two terms possess overlapping but non-identical ranges of application) and the reformists or Westernizers on the other hand. Bhattacharya offers a somewhat different account of this customary subdivision of "our educated men."

(7) Indian society under British domination presents an interesting case. Given the rich, indigenous, pre-British culture of India, one would have expected cultural assimilation. Instead one finds cultural subjection, especially among our educated men.

(8) Such being the case, one finds among them, especially the Westernizers, hybridization rather than synthesis, docile acceptance of the alien idea rather than a critique of the fundamentals, unawareness of the inherited or hasty comparison between the inherited and the alien rather

than critical comparison between the two, passive survival of inherited ideas as marginal relics rather than a lively sense of continuity between the past and the present, patch-like addition of the alien to Indian culture rather than a translation of the alien into indigenous terms. Even the use of a hybrid language rather than alternating between English and the Indian language appears to reflect this state of affairs.

(9) Even the conservative or revivalist stance from an impotent resentment rather than a critical and therefore selective rejection grounded in a true appreciation of any conflict between the alien and the indigenous. (One wishes that Bhattacharya had developed this insight further and brought out how uncritical conservatism/revivalism and uncritical reformism are but two sides of the same coin; namely, a basic sense of insecurity, loss of nerve. Adler would have called it the unconscious inferiority complex, which sometimes parades as boasting about the superiority of the indigenous.)

(10) How to account for this strange and sorry state of affairs? The primary cause is of course the crippling sense of helplessness in the face of a foreign power from which only a genius may escape. But there is a secondary cause also. It appears that our educated men have uncritically swallowed the Western idea of a brusque rationalism, a plea for the rational and therefore universal conceived in abstract terms without any organic relationship with the inherited and local.

(11) One should rather conceive of the rational and therefore universal in terms of the concrete universal and so brought into organic relationship with its particular manifestation. Thus, an alien idea if found acceptable after critical appraisal will have to be thoroughly assimilated to the indigenous if it is to have its expected beneficial effects. While brusque rationalism may do for science and technology, only mature rationalism will do for human sciences and humanities.

Again, a historical footnote, Bhattacharya does not use the expressions "organic" and "concrete", but clearly means what these expressions say. The two alternative versions of rationalism-universalism correspond to the utilitarian-British-Continental-idealistic-vitalistic-Coleridgeian version that we have mentioned earlier. (Compare Mill's essays on Béntham and Coleridge.)

Assuming that this is a fair and correct account of Bhattacharya's plea for a Svaraj in ideas addressed to his contemporary Indians, one can se how it may give comfort but no justification to the misreading, namely, that Bhattacharya is pleading for nativism, for Svadeshi in ideas. The parenthetic observations under items (6) and (9) are critical - they lead us to see both how the misreading may arise and also how the reading is indeed a misreading. So much for plugging the leak, blocking the escape route. Now for a critical assessment of item 10, which offers Bhatacharya's explanation for the sad state of affairs. In my opinion Bhatacharya's explanation is correct in so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. It does not tell us, for example, why there were not enough geniuses around to escape the paralysis of political slavery and so to rescue the other geniuses, if not the rest of the élite , if not the masses. The embarrassing fact is that even some geniuses could not wholly escape cultural subjection. (I am sure that Bhattacharya would not have defined such figures out of the class of geniuses to save his hypothesis!)

I now offer a hypothesis supplementary to Bhattacharya's hypothesis, with which I have no essential quarrel. (For ease of reference, I shall continue numbering items).

(12) The Indian response is puzzling if we recognize the high degree of development of the indigenous culture as inherited from the distant past, but not so puzzling if we recognize the high degree of degeneration of the Indian society and culture of the recent past. While the alien ideas of the West sprang from real minds functioning in a rich and vigorous life, the indigenous ideas of pre-British

India had already lost this support of real minds and a rich and strong life. The paralysis of political slavery under invading Muslim rulers and indigenous but partially de-Indianized Muslim rulers cannot wholly account for this loss of support.

(13) There was an earlier atrophy of Indian culture. Indigenous ideas couched in highly literary languages like Sanskrit and Pali and Prakrit had already lost touch with the life as it was lived from day to day in the vernaculars. On the one hand the vernaculars had no prose of ideas; for the masses and even for most educated men the indigenous ideas were either a sealed book or available in attenuated or garbled versions. On the other hand, even for those who cold wield the literary languages the expressions in these languages had become overly abstract terms with no organic contact with everyday life or, worse still, mere names to be repeated parrot-like.

(14) The Indian response to the West involved, among other things, the replacement of Sanskrit by English. No wonder the first attempts at a prose of ideas in the vernaculars were very often couched in English in the guise of Sanskritized translations imperfectly fusing with the vernacular.

(15) The Medieval resurgence (associated with the bhakti poets) and the Indian awakening (misnamed the Indian Renaissance) were two attempts to counteract this atrophy). Both these attempts fell short of the job on hand, but this should not detract from their spirit and partial success.

"Our educated men" have too often been made the whipping boys by the various physicians, Marxist or otherwise, diagnosing the malaise of this wounded civilization or giving the "native" civilization a clean bill of health. I still have no answer to the remoter question, namely, why the Indian civilization atrophied in the first place, and why the two indigenous attempts to pull it our and up by its bootstraps fell short of the job. (For a brave attempt to tackle the first sub-question, see D.D. Kosambi's writings on the Indian civilization.)

In any case I feel that we shall gain a better perspective on the problem that was the occasion of Bhattacharya's anguish, if we compare the Indian response to the West with the response of the Islamic World, of China, of Japan, and now of Africa. Again, before we glibly plug for "roots" and "going native" and "authenticity", we must realize that in India with its regional, religious, caste-based, and class-based heterogeneity these terms are relative. If "cosmopolitan" universals can be suspect to the rooted Indian, "pan-Indian" universals are equally suspect to the particular Indian rooted in his region, religion, caste, and class. Finally, as I have hastened to point out earlier, Bhatacharya's diagnosis and remedy are no more free from alien ideas, well assimilated Western ideas to be sure, than the thinking of the whipping boys is, at least some of whom achieve cultural assimilation some of the time.

Deccan College,

Pune.

4

The Transformation of Marathi Literary Sensibility 1820-1920

Obviously the transformation of Maharashtra culture over the period 1820 to 1920 is part of a larger process that I prefer to call the Indian Awakening (Bharatiya Prabodhan) rather than the Indian Renaissance. I propose, first to characterize the Indian awakening (Section I), then to look at Maharashtra and its literary life in that perspective (Section II), and finally to go into specifics to lend some body to my argument (Section III).

A Perspective on the Indian Awakening

The European Renaissance was brought by the breakdown of the feudal order and the rise of city states and national monarchies, the revival of Graeco-Latin learning, the exploratory sea voyages to the East and to the Western hemisphere, and the rise of mercantilism, and it was followed by the Protestant Reformation and the scientific Revolution. Europe moved to the Modern Age. The Indian Awakening, on the other hand, is the externally originating process of the Modern Age moving to the shores of south Asia. It is true that a certain analogy of limited validity could be drawn between the absolute monarchies and the Protestant Reformation of Europe on the one hand and the Mughal Empire (and some of the regional monarchies) and the Bhakti and Sufi movements of India on the other hand.

But when one considers the much later social, cultural, and ideological upheaval of 19th century India one has to concede that

this upheaval was almost wholly a result of the coming of the British rule. The ten-century-old isolationism of Indian culture from the rest of human civilization came to an abrupt end in the 18th and 19th centuries. The agency of change was not European culture as such but European capitalist imperialism in the practical-minded, gradualist, Benthamite-liberal English version. The British rule brought along not only its Pax Brittanica but also its liberal reforms, its Christian evangelists, and of course its economic exploitation.

With Europe the shift from the Medieval ethos to the Modern ethos was a shift from a feudal to a mercantile social order and from an Other-directed personality (where the expression 'the Other' is to be taken in its broadest application) to a personality directed by a search for a new order.

The European Renaissance introduced secularism, individualism, and nationalism. The European Enlightenment of the 18th century strengthened the values of egalitarianism, utilitarianism,and rationalism, and was followed by the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. The Indian awakening partook a little of both the European Renaissance and the European Enlightenment, but equaled neither in depth or scope. It was essentially an attempt to catch up with four centuries of European history (the 15th to the 18th). The values that European modernity espoused touched upon -

(i) the relation between man and universe (rationality in understanding it and utilitarianism in reshaping it);

(ii) the relation between man and man (egalitarianism at home and nationalism to the rest of the world; and

(iii) the relation between man and the self (individualism and secularism in relation to the Other).

The best way to capture the resurgence of a prostrate Indian in the 19th century is through two vivid and celebrated images - one image from Tilak's famous tribute to Ranade, whom he credited with infusing life into cold, nearly lifeless flesh of the body social, and the other image from Tagore's ode evoking the heaven into which he would some day see his country awake.

While the values of European modernity were adopted, and adapted in the process, by the leaders of the Indian Awakening at some stage or other and at some point or other, it did not equal European modernity, as we have just said, either in depth or scope.

To begin with, the Awakening was not segmented but fragmented - by religion (for example, the Muslims were only partially drawn into it, social reform and women's emancipation were indeed far removed from their thoughts), by classes aligned by caste and community (for example, the scholars and professional of Maharashtra were only imperfectly in touch with the new merchants like Jagannath Sankarsett and the new merchant-industrialists like Jamshetji Tata and the peasant discontent associated with names like Vasudeo Balwant Phadke and Jyotiba Phule), and by region (for example, in spite of being one of the three presidency towns of the East India Company's rule and being the seat of one of the three oldest universities set up in 1857, Madras for some reason never figured as a 'renaissance' center along with Bombay and Calcutta). An interesting consequence of this fragmentation is that Indian life even today appears to be split down the middle between a deshi segment innocent of the English language and western models and a videshi segment suflused with these - the split affects dress and living style, sports, the arts, medicine, trade and commerce (commodity market and handicraft versus manufactured goods), scholarship and educational effort, and so on.

Naturally the awakening is not all-pervasive in the way the European Renaissance was-thus, it is significant that Marx didn't reach the Indian intellectuals till the beginning of the 20th century; that the critique of religion among the Hindus was not followed by the emergence of new philosophical thought; that Europe continued to mean for Indians Europe through Anglo-Saxon eyes; and that one comes across personalities uneasily hovering between orthodoxy and reform all through this period.

Finally, the Renaissance man was largely conspicuous by his absence. The nearest we come to personalities alive to many sides of life are Raja Rammohan Roy (religious and social reformer, educationist, scholar), Justice M.G. Ranade (statesman, economist, historian, religious and social reformer), Rabindranath Tagore (poet, painter, thinker, and founder of Visvabharati as well as Sriniketan), and Mahatma Gandhi (political and social activist, religious and economic critic). One has only to consider these personalities and their impact in comparison with their European counterparts and also with their Indian contemporaries.

If the Indian Awakening was of an external origination, its content was not wholly of European inspiration. Not only were European values filtered and adapted to suit the native cultural idiom, but there were often, especially on the part of the Hindus, a certain attempt to seek out affinities between the values of European modernity and Indian ways of life. For Hindus rationalism was not entirely alien - the d¡rsanika (philosopher) was willing to follow tarka (logic) pratyakÀa (sense perception and mental perception) even in opposition to scriptures; even utilitarianism could find a bedfellow in the doctrine of vyavadh¡ra and apaddharma; nationalism was not to be seen as too different from svadharma; egalitarianism was seen to have affinities with the suspension of inequalities in bhakti; individualism has affinities with the doctrine of atmastuti (satisfying one's inner self) in morals and the acceptance of loneliness in spiritual matters; and secularism was 'restarted' as the acceptance of plurality of paths in spiritual quest (lately christened as sarvadharmasamabhava - read dharma here as mata, which may be any denomination within or outside the Hindu fold).

Of course such affinities are far from being identities. The Hindu mind has certainly not fully come to terms with the rationalist search for reasoned faith in areas where logic and sense perception are inconclusive; with utilitarianism as against the centrality of the sacred; with nationalism as against family and caste loyalty; with egalitarianism as against the social inequalities of ritual status; with individualism as against deference to the elders, to custom, and to scriptures; and with secularism as against the recognition of the pervasive character of the sacred. Indeed an important fall-out of the Western Indological effort and the

partial victory of the 'Orientalists' in the policy debate preceding the 1885 decision on 'public instruction' in Mecaulay's time was hat the new educated élite could be counted upon to learn a classical language like Sanskrit as a part of regular schooling and to take a fresh and selective look at their heritage.

One must not confuse the mere survival of the past among the naively orthodox with the self-conscious revival of the past as with the Arya Samajist, who is as much at Joggerheads with the naïve 'Sanatanist' as with the Reformist. Indeed the very reality of the past is in question. Is it the surviving past (as with the observance of untouchability) or the carefully reconstructed past (as with Vedic Aryans or Buddhist India) or the not-so-carefully 'refurbished' past (as with the Golden Age)?

To sum up, the cultural transformation of the Indian society of the period 1820-1920 (of which the cultural transformation of Maharashtra is but a part) is defined by the Indian awakening, which stood for regeneration of a prostrate society through a partial assimilation of the values of European modernity and through the rediscovery of Indian values - especially those from the distant past rather than from the immediate Medieval past. Educating the public and educating the young were the most widely shared programmes of the leaders of the Indian Awakening.

Maharashtra and Marathi Literary Sensibility

Given the regional fragmentation of the Indian Awakening, it is only to be expected that its manifestation in Maharashtra should be distinct in some respects. Given the earlier exposure of Bengal to the British rule and its concomitants, one can see how Bengal was one generation 'ahead' of Maharashtra - a phase difference of about thirty years. The visit of Keshub Chunder sen to Bombay where he met Ranade marks the beginning of the period (circa 1870-1920) of the direct influence of Bengal on Maharashtra (extending even to the choice of innovative personal names among Hindus!). Bengal's gift to Maharashtra was the founding of Pr¡rthan¡ Sam¡j in Bombay which was a less radical break-off than Brahmo Sam¡j from the Hindu fold; thenovels of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Sharad Chatterjee and Rabindranath

tagore in Marathi translations; the writings of Vivekanand; the habilitation of mysticism and bhakti in the modern ambience; the idealization of womanhood; an inducement to think in universalist and cosmopolitan terms; and the recognition of the visual arts as culturally serious pursuits.

In Western India, the administrative boundaries between Bombay Presidency, the Central Provinces and Berar, and the Nizam's Dominion counted as much as the linguistic boundaries between Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka, and the so-called Hindi belt. Thus, the Awakening came to Bombay and Pune before it came to other cities in Maharashtra, to the so-called west Maharashtra before it came to Vidarbha and Marathwada - to name the three administrative fragments of Maharashtra. (The natural segments of Maharashtra are Konkan and the four riverine valleys of the Tapi, the pranhita, the Godavari, and the Bhima and Krishna). At the same time Bombay and, to a lesser extent, Pune served as radiating centers for the whole of the Presidency - Sindh, Gujarat, and northwest Karnataka no less than west Maharashtra.

Again, while some casts and religious communities tended to retire into a shell of added glory, others were quick to adapt themselves to the new set-up and the life-style that went with it. Three economically definable groups in Maharashtra became exposed to the newer influences in relative isolation from each other, namely, the professionals and office-goers (the so-called p¡¸·harpeš¡, or madhyam varga - containing as it were counterparts of both the bhadralok and the babus of Bengal), and the urban and urbanized working classes (such as the Bombay mill hand and the army private). The cultural leadership passed from the Sanskrit Pandits and the landholders of the new 'middle class'. The educational, literary, and intellectual activity, which was both an instrument and outgrowth of change, was largely the handiwork of the first group. The extension and reworking of commerce and industry on the lines initiated by the British was the work of the second group. (It is awkward to apply the term Indian bourgeoisie to both the first group and the second group indifferently, as some Indian Marxists are apt to do.)

The picture of the socio-cultural landscape of Maharashtra in this phase will not be complete without a close look at what we have earlier called the surviving past, the constructed past, and the refurbished past. The relevant elements in each for the Indian Awakening in Maharashtra can be set out as follows.

The elements of the surviving past that made a difference were the prevalence of the raiyatw¡r¢ system of landholding and land revenue over the zam¢nd¡r¢ system especially in west Maharashtra), the stronger emphasis on the worth of the bhakta greater egalitarianism between the bhaktas, for whom God is anything but a lord or thakur), the devaluation of ritualism (karmak¡nda) and sectarianism (the Shaiva __neshvar being the patron saint of the vaishnava v¡rkar¢s), a strong emphasis on additional scholarship (especially in Vyakarana, Vedanta, and Nyaya), and a tradition of social criticism (as seen in the satire of Tukaram and Ramdas).

Maharashtra scholarship actively joined hands with western scholars in reconstructing the Indian and the regional past. The panorama of history - whether it is man's prehistory or Classical and Medieval Europe or Ancient, Classical, and Medieval India, or Medieval Maharashtra - became a vital fixture of consciousness. Thus the rediscovery of Buddhism by Dharmanand Kosambi or of Ajanta and Ellora by archaeologists or of Kautilya's Arthaš¡stra created a stir beyond scholarly circles.

Some of the exercises in refurbishing history that made a deep impression on the middle class and even others are - the Vedic Aryans were seen to be at once pastoral nomads with a simple life and civilizing agents for pre-Aryan India; the Varkaris were seen as our very own Protestants making Hinduism more democratic, less impersonal, and so more worthy of being saved by the brave Maratha soldiery from the onslaught of Islam picking up where the Rajputs had left off and being joined later by the Sikhs. A history of Old and Middle Marathi literature was written highlighting the tradition of bhakti, of Sanskrit-based poetry, and the bards of the camp singing of war and love (the trio of santa, panta and tanta poets).

This refurbishing of the past correlates with a certain projection of the future of India (in which Maharashtra was to play a proud rôle). India was not only a nation struggling for freedom after centuries of Islamic and British subjugation but also a society internally striving for a just order within itself and externally playing a vital role in a world order.

The vision of the past and the future was a part of a novel non-cyclic time perspective that was informed by the idea of history not merely as a storehouse of moral exempla but rather as a major dimension of human life (enshrined in expressions like badalta jamana and yugadharma).

Such then is the landscape against which to see the transformation of Marathi literary sensibility over this period. But isn't literary sensibility but a part of artistic sensibility?

When one uses expressions like Baroque Art (Continental Europe, the late 16th and the 17th centuries) or Romantic Art (Western Europe, the late 18th and 19th centuries), one thinks of the visual arts, music, as well as literature all together. When one thinks of the cultivation of the arts in ancient India, one thinks of Markandeya's account (Visnudharmottara Puran, 6th century A.D., part 3, the dialogue with Vajra) as to how worship involves all the arts and how each art involves the rest.

Even in Medieval India where a certain fragmentation sets in, one could still find it useful to interrelate the 17th century rise respectively of khayal singing of Hindustani classical music, of the courtly version of Kathak dancing, of certain modes of courtly poetry, and of certain styles of miniature painting. With the arts of Modern India the fragmentation is complete.

The literary arts comprising poetry, fiction, essay, and literature-dominated theatre and cinema stand together as one group by itself. (The remaining groups are: (a) music, dance, and theatre dominated by these; (b) painting, sculpture, and architecture; and (c) decorative and design arts and recreative arts such as the commercial cinema and lately the commercial theatre. The habilitation of Hindustani classical music as a worthy modern pursuit was, it may be noted in passing, the gift of Maharashtra.)

In Maharashtra of this period the practice of the literary arts and the thinking connected with them was associated with an awareness, if not actual knowledge, of English language and literature as well as Sanskrit language and literature. As the anthropologists would say, the literary arts and ideology were open to modernization as well as 'Brahmanization'. The new literary models from English were provided by the Golden Treasury view of English poetry from the pre-Romantics like Gray to the post-Romantics like Tennyson, by the essay from Addison to Carlyle, by the historical novel of Scott, by the novel of social portrayal (svatantra s¡m¡jik k¡dambar¢), and, last but not least, by the tragedies of Shakespeare and the comedies of Moliere. Some of the other values that Maharashtra assimilated from the English were - the place of humour in life and in art; the recognition of the literary theatre as art and as a social force (thee was hardly any Indian literary theatre to speak of after the demise of the Classical Sanskrit theatre) and consequently greater attention to the study of Sanskrit plays (earlier study of Sanskrit literature put greater stress on narrative poetry and didactic mukatas); the Enlightenment notion of the 'great man'; and the Romantic idealization of love between the sexes and of the creative genius.

A distinctive feature of the modern Marathi literary scene is that, unlike the case, say, of modern, Telugu, the surviving past has no further literary history beyond 1870 except as assimilated and transformed in the modern context - there are no significant successors to the santa,panta, and tanta poets (the only exceptions that come to mind are, respectively, Dasganu, Sadhudas, Patthe Bapurao, all of the early part of the 20th century).

The values of European modernity - rationalism, utilitarianism, nationalism, egalitarianism, individualism, secularism - naturally turned up in the subject mater and content of literature which was seen as an educative medium. What is more to the point is that some of these values turned up in literary criticism and literary theorizing as well. Indeed Marathi speakers were not content, for example, with attempts to translate, write, and stage tragedies but had to discuss this activity, to mount a critique of the Sanskrit ban on the unhappy ending, and to account for the strange enjoyment

of the tragic form. Literary criticism and literary theorizing (more recently, aesthetics too) has been a preoccupation of the Marathi men of letters. A brief consideration of what this kind of activity could lead to in modern India is called for. The contemporary literary theorist in India enjoys a double heritage, Classical and Medieval Indian literary thought and Classical and Modern Western literary thought. It is not as if he has a native and borrowed literary consciousness - which would be a most unpromising predicament. Rather he has to come to terms with his own composite literary experience in terms of his own composite stock of ideas.

Western poetics up to and including the Enlightenment had moved in a certain direction. Idealist philosophy and Romantic criticism acutely sensed (as with Kant, Schlegel, Coleridge) certain inadequacies in its excessive emphasis on the imitation of and continuity with ordinary life in the realm of art. Classical Sanskrit poetics is strong precisely in this respect. (The Western Indologists' failure to perceive this strength and transmit the insights to western literary thinkers is a sad cause of an opportunity missed).

Correspondingly, Indian poetics up to the Indian Awakening had moved in a certain direction. The Indian literary thinkers of this period acutely sensed certain inadequacies in its excessive emphasis on shared harmony and on the transcendence of conflict and of personal need (no sharp departures, no tragedies, and no cris de Coeur please!) and in its almost total neglect of the other harmony of prose and of practical criticism evaluating and interpreting specific texts and considering the problems arising thereform. They were fascinated and impressed, therefore, by Western theories of style as personal expression, of tragedy, of lyric, of prose and by Western practical criticism.

Naturally modern consciousness, whether western or Indian, is not wholly content with the tradition inherited; for one thing it defines its own problems. One of the first things it newly became aware of was the dimension of the timely and the historical to literary creation and appreciation, and the r²le of the innovative creativity in forcing us from time to time to review our ideas of art and literature.

THE SPIRIT OF THE INDIAN FLAG

An animal lives in the here and the now. The human animal extends the here to there and yonder - the settlement, the region and so on. Having the capacity to recall and to anticipate, the human animal extends the now to then and forever - Oral history and Oral forecast, written history and written forecast and so on. The nation is the modern European contribution to this expansion of the human horizon - with its political and economic support and its discursive, stylistic, and symbolic expression. Everybody is now speaking of globalization - without realizing that India has a lot to teach in this matter to the rest of the world. Over many centuries India has evolved its own version of mini-globalization, something in between the European nation state and the United Nations (The European Union is but a poor copy of the Indian Union!)

What has been the drive cowards the emergence of the Indian Union? What has been the underlying spirit that the Indian Flag symbolizes?

(i) Fraternity in liberty rather than untrammeled pursuit of individual happiness.

(ii) Fraternity through justice rather than justice as equality in mediocrity.

(iii) Diversity and unity rather than diversity by itself or unity by itself.

(iv) Panchasheel in relation to the rest of the world rather than any dream of world hegemones.

Into that heaven let our country awake!

PASSING THE TORCH ON

The relationship between the taught and the teacher fascinates me. I suppose this is in part because I have enjoyed the relationship from both ends. Yes, 'enjoyed' is the word. I had a rather long innings as one taught from the Infant Class, as it used to be called those days, to the course-work followed by the writing of the thesis towards a Doctorate in Philosophy, all without much of a break and again a long innings as one teaching undergraduates,

postgraduates, and doctoral candidates. I can say for sure that my enjoyment was conditioned both by traditional India's conception of the relationship and the modern European conception of it. There was no sense of discontinuity or any resulting discomfort in my stint as a student, thanks to my teachers, or at least some of them. How do I know how, at a later date, my own students found me as a teacher? More of that latter, first the two conceptions.

With us in traditional India, there are two key words for the teacher, guru and ¡ch¡rya. Earlier, both terms simply meant someone who initiates the young to thesacred ritual. In the course of history, guru came to be associated with the mysteries of the quest, whether spiritual or artistic. Guru was larger than life (guru means large after all); he was the gracious master who transmited the torch of energy. Acharya come to be associated with the determined search for truth, whether philosophical or scientific. The acharya was the elder pathfinder; indeed he aspires to be excelled by someone he has taught (¿isy¡d icchet par¡jayam); he was the kind father, who initiated the dialogue (v¡da-viv¡da) and transmitted the torch of knowledge. We in India were content to use the same correlative for both these terms, namely, áiÀya, one to be disciplined (áikÀa). (In Islamic India, one comes across the terms ust¡d and maulavÌ, which correspond, after making due allowances, to the terms guru and acharya respectively, á¡gird being the correlative of both). Modern Europe, on the contrary, differentiates the two kinds of the taught; pupil / élève / Sch£ler and student /étudiant / Student. The pupil is the little child led by the hand by the teacher, who may be the ordinary school teacher or the eminent pathfinder among scholars. The student is one who studies diligently and systematically, whether in attendance to a teacher or simply pursuing knowledge in the footsteps of those who have taught him earlier.

A moment's thought will show that there is a certain correspondence between the Indian and the European conception: between the guru and the pupil on the one hand and again between the acharya and the student. So the two conceptions are not all that distinct, but there is a difference nevertheless. In

traditional India, there is such a great weightage to the guru mode that even an acharya stands in danger of shading into the guru and so being implicitly followed. In modern Europe, one sets a higher store by the student mode so much so that even a school pupil stands in danger of being pressed into diligent and systematic study. (The malady probably spread from France to other countries).

To reminisce about my teachers is thus for me to contemplate the emergence of a fusion mode in my own relationship with them, fusion of the guru and pupil mode and the acharya and student mode.

Looks as if I was destined to be a grammarian after passing through an apprenticeship in literature with our class teacher, Shri D K Kulkarni, in the last two years of high school, the tenth and eleventh years in those days. He taught us English, literary selections, grammar, and composition. He used to encourage us to put questions about whatever he happened to be teaching. The pleasure he took in this activity was so obvious that the last quarter of the school hour often turned into a discussion session. At one point I asked him about some detail of English grammar that puzzled me. Instead of lucidly explaining that point as he usually did, he suggested that I look him up later in the teacher's common room so that we could talk about it. so, when I saw him in the school recess I was naturally in some trepidation, wondering what faux pas I had committed. He quietly led me by the hand to the adjoining school library hall, stopped at a shelf marked 'Grammar' and took out a couple of volumes, The Philosophy of Grammar and Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin, both by the renowned Danish scholar, Otto Jespersen. Putting these into my hands and suggesting that in future I take up puzzlements with 'this fine gentleman'. Wittingly or unwittingly, a kindly school teacher had introduced me to a torchbearer, who made sure that I later found early American Linguistic structuralism not wholly satisfying.

Now comes my apprenticeship in English literature as an undergraduate. Two of my teachers, Shri M.G. Bhate (who combined an MA in English with a London School BSc in

Economics) and Shri G.P. Pradhan (who combined an infectious zest for literature with a jail term in India's Emergency in his future). Shri Bhate introduced me to the importance of the scrutiny critics and the socio-economic background of literature, and Shri Pradhan to the sheer enjoyment of literature and placing it in the context of life. In their differing ways, both had the ability to get even the backbenchers in the class excited and to inculcate a love of Shakespeare. (In later life, when it was suggested to me that a patriotic Indian couldn't possibly love English literature or that a socially committed reader of literature ought not possibly indulge in the frivolity of enjoying literary beauty I was, and still am, all incomprehension.)

And finally, my experience of doing a doctorate in an American university, a far western outpost of European civilization. I duly drafted my doctoral thesis on Marathi phonology and morphology and handed in the draft to my research supervisor, Professor Hockett's red-ink pen, I was in some trepidation when he later handed my draft back to me totally unscathed. I was wondering to myself whether he found it too unworthy even to touch with his red-ink pen, when he broke in : "You could give it to the typist, no problem. Well, actually there are four spots wherein you have in passing raised problems about some of my views on points of linguistic analysis. In two cases you have succeeded in convincing me of my error and in the other two you haven't but really you have argued your point well, which is all that matters in a doctoral thesis." I was taken aback, unable to imagine an Indian research supervisor doing anything of the kind. Having recovered from the shock, I realized that I had duly earned the right to call him Charles rather than Professor Hockett as I had been doing so far. I was inoculated against the colonial hangover for life.

Later, when I found myself in the shoes of a teacher, I wondered from time to time how I fared as a teacher in the eyes of my students. Quite a few of them told me after we got to know each other better. They told me about their puzzlement about me. In sum, their puzzlement was as to whether I was a starlet taskmaster or an indulgent senior friend, for I was both by turns. They couldn't place me; they couldn't because they had no pigeonhole

for the fusion mode, being good Indians. Mine was a fusion mode in quite another sense too. I was doing a stint as a visiting professor in a university language and literature department, lecturing on linguistic and literary theory by turns. It was a composite group of those doing their respective MA in English and Marathi. Once I sought to draw a student out informally on how my use of English worked in the classroom floor. He assured me that there was no problem even with students of Marathi (as he was). As he warmed to the subject, he casually remarked about my fusion mode: "You have truly introduced us to the linguistic and literary thinkers; it is as if the other day we were listening to a round-table debate on poetic theory that was going on with Aristotle and Abhinavagupta, Jµ¡nešvara and Coleridge, Richards and D.K. Bedekar participating." It was a humbling experience for me to realize that I had unwittingly afforded my students such a globalizing learning experience and in part repaid my debt (¤¸a) to my teachers.

Perhaps, my two fusion modes, the guru-pupil and acharya-student mode on the one hand and the mode exploiting the double intellectual inheritance, Indian and European on the other hand, are not two distinct fusion modes at all but a single composite Indian-European globalizing teaching mode after all.

Hindu nationalism & women

Dalits have reason to be worried, with the RSS in control of the Ministry of Human Resources Development. Not only is it in a position to impose its cultural agenda on the nation, but it also seems to be moving to cut off the development of a Dalit intelligentsia which has been one of the powerful forces challenging it. Recent correspondence calling for an end to reservation for Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students at the M.Phil and Ph.D. level is an indication of this. So are statements in the Rajya Sabha by Ms. Vasundhra Raje, Minister of State for Personnel, that the Government is considering applying an ``income criterion'' for reservation.

But if Dalits should be concerned, so should women. The kind of nationalism that is being peddled by the RSS is one that has

been functioning for the last century and a half to maintain the highly subordinate position of women in India. The nature of women's encounter with nationalism is a complex one and has been endlessly dissected in recent scholarship.

On the one hand, the role of women in national liberation movements has legitimised their coming out of the home into the public sphere, and has helped them confront their own subordination within a domestic patriarchy along with the national oppressor. It has left a heritage of struggle and pride, as indicated in the title ``We Also Made History'' given to an account of women's role in the Telengana movement.

On the other hand, the elite's concern to defend their ``national culture'' against western invasion has led them to defend the subordination of women to the community, and with it some of the most retrograde of traditional customs. The well-known paradigm is the veil: women in many Muslim countries threw aside the veil as they emerged to take part in the struggle, or at times used it as a form of disguise, a means of hiding from imperialist forces. But after the struggle, in too many cases the veil was re- imposed. Not only the veil; African nationalists like Jomo Kenyatta were ready to defend even the cruel custom of female circumcision as a symbol of tradition and self which had to be maintained.

The long-term meaning of nationalism for women, then, has varied with the collective strength they have gained in the course of struggle. Too often it seems that the male nationalist elite has been able to deprive them of this strength. The case of India is becoming increasingly well documented with recent scholarship. Among some of the most important works are historian Uma Chakravarty's study of Pandita Ramabai and her times, titled ``Rewriting History'', and an impressive collection of articles edited by Chakravarty and Kumkum Sangari, ``From Myths to Markets''. Pandita Ramabai was the daughter of an outcast Brahman - outcast partly for educating his daughters - and famously defended by Mahatma Phule for her contributions to women's education. Phule had argued that education was the key to women's liberation as

to that of the ``Shudras and Ati-Shudras'', saying that once the daughters and daughters-in-law of Brahmans learnt to read the sacred scriptures they would scornfully hurl them all away.

But this did not happen; although Ramabai herself was an early feminist, founder of perhaps the first autonomous women's organisation, she was neatly sidelined by the elite after she converted to Christianity, having discovered that in her words, ``there were two things on which all these books the Dharmashastras, the sacred epics, the Puranas and modern poets, the popular preachers of the present day and orthodox high caste men were agreed, that women... as a class were all bad, very bad, worse than demons, as unholy as untruth, and that they could not get moksa like men''.

This was too much for even the moderate Brahmans, who continued to idealise many aspects of ancient Vedic society.

But in telling this story, it needs to be asked, whose history is Chakravarty rewriting? Apparently that of the nationalists themselves, including such contemporary intellectuals as Partha Chatterjee of the well- known Subaltern studies school. In an early article Chatterjee had argued that the ``nationalist resolution of the women's question'' was achieved when the nationalists used the division between ``inner'' and ``outer'', the ``home'' and the ``outside'' world to maintain the inner, spiritual world as the realm of their inviolate cultural essence, barred to western aggression in contrast to the humiliation they had to face in the public world of the colonisers. Women became both the symbol of the inner world and its guardians; they were not to be subordinated in the traditional religious way but they were to be discouraged from taking part in the public sphere except as an extension of the home, and they were to be educated to be conveyers of the national culture. It may be said that just as the RSS is out to control education today, nationalist men were anxious to control it from the nineteenth century onwards.

For Indian women, however, the inner world has had characteristics of a prison; the family has been the collective agent of her subordination. Escaping from the ``four walls'' of the home

has always been a major theme of women's struggles for liberation, whether they were organising as part of the broader workers' or farmers' movement or on their own issues. It is no wonder then that feminists have begun to critique Chatterjee for being too satisfied with his ``nationalist resolution'', indeed, the communitarians who have posed the national community as an alternative to the heartless individualism of the world of western commercialism have generally been silent about what these communities have meant for women. Thus in a recent article in The Economic and Political Weekly, Himani Banerjee notes that Chatterjee's writings on the women's question signalled a departure from the earlier agenda of Subaltern studies of critiquing nationalism and recovering the history of the oppressed.

Feminists have also extended the interpretation of this ``nationalist resolution''. One of the strongest chapters in Chakravarty's book is a depiction not of the orthodox elite but of the liberal reformer M. G. Ranade. Ranade, as is well known, caved in to family pressures and rather than marry a child widow, agreed to marry the girl chosen by his father. He then had her educated - but to be a suitable companion and fit wife and mother for a new generation of ``modern'' Indians. It was not so different from Gandhi dragging Kasturba along with his dietary quirks and his brahmachari vows.

This ``guided'' education of women, organised both privately and in public schemes for women's education, was designed to undercut the radical potential of education that had been embodied in the spectre of Pandita Ramabai. It produced women such as Anandibai Joshi and Kashibai Kanitkar, who - as is shown by Meera Kosambi's study in the Myths to Markets volume - in spite of being a woman doctor and woman novelist respectively, continued to subordinate themselves to their family.

In becoming educated, they had to confront all the tensions generated among more orthodox women left behind. ``Women became the site where the conflict between the old and the new was played out'' as Kosambi puts it. In Bengal also, the first woman's autobiography by Rashsundari Debi reveals the incredible

amount of household labour even elite women put in to maintaining the traditional ``inner world'' to the liking of nationalists.

Thus the nationalist project of maintaining the spiritual core of their culture, identified with the family, often simply gave a new justification for ongoing patriarchal control of women's sexuality and labour.

By many measures, India is one of the most patriarchal countries in the world. It has lower female literacy rates than many African countries; only recently have women's lifespans begun to equal men's - in sharp contrast to most countries where women tend to outlive men - and maternal mortality rates remain high. The most stark measure of all is perhaps Prof. Amartya Sen's concept of ``missing women'' - the low sex ratio in India means that some 37 million to 38 million women who might otherwise be alive today have died due to neglect and maltreatment.

This seems clearly related to aspects of Indian culture, rather than simply worldwide economic and political processes. Feminists have been reluctant to examine the specific casual factors behind this, in particular the role of Brahmanism and caste society, though condemning Manu is a common theme of the women's movement. However, one of those who had asked analytical questions recently, Nirmala Banerjee, comes up with some provocative answers. Banerjee's essay, ``Analyzing Women's Work Under Patriarchy'', is published in the volume ``From Myths to Markets'' edited by Kumkum Sangari and Uma Chakravarty, and begins with a critique of the ``common sense'' understanding that greater workforce participation will give more independence to women. Banerjee argues against both neo-classical and marxist versions of this, claiming that the evidence in India is against it, showing that jobs are often defined as ``women's work'' and assigned low pay and status only after they get filled by women. Indeed, many of the other studies in the volume document the continuing joint family control over women's work; just as with education, the potentially liberating influence of ``economic'' independence has been neutralised by patriarchal controls in India.

The solution that Banerjee favours derives from a thesis by Heidi Hartmann in regard to European developments. Hartmann argues that male control over women's participation in the workforce - and the resulting low pay and worsened conditions for women - did not come simply from the prior subordinate position of women in the family, with time occupied in domestic work and childcare. Rather, the specific collective powers gained by male workers through the trade union movement functioned against women in Europe, allowing them to use union regulations and powers to subordinate women both in the workplace and the home. In Europe what gained strength with the rise of capitalist industrialisation was the notion of a ``family wage'' which assumed the existence of a working male and a house-bound wife. Strikingly, the institution that proved helpful for the betterment of male workers' condition, unions, worked against women.

Hartmann's thesis, as Banerjee notes, does not apply per se to India, where the union movement was never so strong. But it does point to collective agency, and it suggests - though Banerjee does not herself draw this conclusion - that the equivalent in India to the labour movement in Europe, the nationalist movement, played the same role. The ideological role played by the ``family wage'' in maintaining home and children in Europe was matched by the cultural-nationalist role of the ``Hindu woman'', modelled after Sita and Savitri, which was popularised and spread in India during the colonial period. It was a time when, as Uma Chakravarti shows in ``Rewriting History'', the differentiated caste- hierarchical model of women's subordination was replaced by a single model. Given the popularity of literature about women, probably as much energy went into building the new structures of women's subordination as into any aspect of national culture.

Recently, some historians have argued that far from caste being a ``timeless'' feature of Indian society it was, if not actually constructed during the colonial period, strengthened and helped to consolidate its hold throughout India. The ``brahmanic'' model, which had been most hegemonic in the irrigated areas and river valleys, now was taken as the norm throughout. British courts helped in that they enforced ``brahmanic'' as Hindu law, but elite

action was just as crucial. In the same way it can be argued that the new communication and transportation networks in colonial India - and arguments for ``national unity'' against the alien rulers - helped the patriarchal elite in consolidating a ``modern'' form of the subordination of ``Hindu'' women. Women who would otherwise have protested more strongly against oppressive customs were also drawn into assent to them as an aspect of maintaining their national identity; this can be seen in the autobiographical writings of Anandibai Joshi and even Pandita Ramabai, who was provoked by the chauvinism of church authorities to insist on many of the customs of the ``high-caste Hindu woman'' whose situation she was otherwise so critical about.

There was protest against this version of ``national unity'', of course, and arguments that an equalitarian nation had first to be created - coming from Bahujan and Dalit spokesmen such as Phule, Periyar, Ambedkar and others. They also maintained a much more critical view of women's position. Phule's personal life, for example, stood in strong contrast with Ranade's assent to the pressure of his joint family; when he and his wife were childless, they decided to adopt - and going against all ``Hindu'' custom they adopted the son of a brahman widow. It resulted in at least temporary expulsion from the household, not to mention causing somewhat of a storm in the elite circles of Pune, for whom the treatment of brahman widows had become a sore point.

For Phule, the family was very far from being the centre in which the inner spiritual identity of the nationalist Hindu could be maintained; he even postulated that in his ideal family, the father could be a Satyasamajist, the mother a Buddhist, the son a Muslim, the daughter a Christian! This represented a radical separation of the family and cultural identity. Similarly, as V. Geetha has shown, Periyar not only linked the subordination of women to brahmanic caste hierarchy, but also questioned traditional ``Tamil cultural'' notions of chastity.

But these were dissenting voices. It was the ``nationalist resolution of the women's question'' which triumphed, and which has probably helped in maintaining the continued strength of the

patriarchal family and the culture that surrounds it in India today. Now that the BJP is in power, and the RSS is pushing its ``Hindu nationalist'' cultural agenda in all the educational and cultural institutions of society, the situation is likely to become worse - or at least provoke sharpening conflict.

However, the question remains, if the women's movement was too weak in the colonial period to confront elite nationalism with its own equalitarian and nationalist agenda, where is the hope that it will gather renewed strength today?

The Marathas who had established their direct or indirect control over a major part of this sub-continent in the 18th century, were the last rulers of India from whom the British wrested power, as James Grant Duff, the first comprehensive historian of the Marathas, has frankly admitted in his book published in 1826.

Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the Father of Indian Unrest, belonged to the generation of the 19th century Maharashtra, who had not yet forgotten that they were the rulers of this country in the immediate past. As a patriot of the highest order, he dedicated his entire life for the liberation of India from the clutches of the colonial rule of the British over his motherland. He must have thought of history, as the most suitable and effective method to mobilize public opinion against the tyrannical rule of the British. He thought that the career of Shivaji, who was not yet forgotten by the people, would be the best tool which could be used to attract masses towards the freedom struggle. This led him to indulge in deep research about the Marathas, particularly of Shivaji.

The initial success in the research of the antiquity of the Vedas, encouraged him to do further research and as a sequel to his Orion or Researches into the Antiquity of the Vedas, Tilak produced another original research book, `The Arctic Home' in the Vedas' in 1898, during the period of his eighteen months imprisonment at Yervada in 1897-98. The book was, however, published in 1903, because of his busy schedule after his release from imprisonment. The main theme of his research was - where was the earliest home of the Vedas? With a view to resolve this issue he studied geological researches about the commencement

of the post-glacial period, the historic evidence from the Vedic and the allied literature, the characteristics of the polar region, and produced a book entitled `The Arctic Home in the Vedas' having 13 chapters running into 450 pages. He presented a mass of evidence to prove conclusively that before the commencement of the post-glacial epoch, the North Pole regions were inhabited by the Aryan race, and that those people migrated from this place southwards in Asia and Europe not by any `irrestible impulse' but by unwelcome changes in the climatic conditions of their original home.

PLUNGE IN MARATHA HISTORY

However, the peculiar circumstances that were prevailing in the last decades of the 19th century, made him set aside his prime interest in the researches of Ancient India, and plunge into the history of the immediate past of Maharahstra i.e. the Maratha History.

The intellectuals of Maharashtra had started taking interest in their history. Neelakantha Janardhan Kirtane, a junior student of the Deccan College, assailed Grant Duff's History of the Marathas (1826) in his lecture delivered in the Young Men's Association of the College in 1868. He rhetorically pointed out that Grant's History was no more than an account of the military expeditions of the Marathas, rather than the glorious achievements of the Maratha people, of which the people of this region were proud. Rajwade V.K. another historian of the Marathas, after enlisting many deficiencies and mistakes in Grant's History confirmed the assessment of Kirtane and said further that his history was not more than a chronicle. Grant's history was also translated into Marathi by Captain David and Baba Sane and published in 1829-30. Text books on History were prepared on the basis of information contained in these histories which presented a distorted picture of the Maratha Rule with a view to justify their conquest of the country. It was, therefore, necessary to remove the prejudices developed by the non-Marathi speaking people, through reading the historical writings of the British to whom the Marathas were simply plunderers who thrived on looting other Indian powers.

The British rulers, who strove to inculcate the feeling of distrust among the Indians, and prevent the revival of Maratha power, put restrictions on the researches in the Maratha period, which was a hot bed according to them. This restrictive policy of the British denying free access to the archival material preserved in the Government Archives, induced a group of Marathi scholars to launch a popular movement for collecting historical material from the historically old families of the Marathas in the last quarter of the 19th century. Individual historians like Kashinath Narayan Sane (1851-1927) Vasudev Shastri Khare (1858-1924), Vinayak Kashinath Rajwade (1864-1926) and Dattatraya Balwant Parasnis (1870-1926) dug out private archives of Maratha princes, jagirdars, sardars, ministers, and others to counteract the restrictive policy of the colonial rule and present an authentic and real picture of the Maratha power, and remove thereby the misgivings created by the historical writing of the British. Rajwade V.K., for instance founded the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal at Pune in 1910 on the model of the German historian Leopold Von Ranke (1795-1886), with a view to collect, preserve, and publishing authentic source material and promote scientific research in Indian history. The latter half of the 19th century witnessed a flood of historical writings including various forms of literature like novels, plays, poetry, epics, miscellaneous writings, besides the publication of source material. Thus, the period from Gopal Hari Deshmukh, (Popularly known as Lokhitwadi) (1823-1892) to Lokmanya B.G. Tilak (1856-1920) produced many historical writings, which helped to awaken the interests of masses in their past history.

IMMEDIATE CAUSE

However the immediate cause which aroused much interest in Shivaji among the intellectuals, elites and masses of Maharashtra was the references to the dilapidated condition of Shivaji's tomb at Raigad, made by a British visitor James Douglas in his work entitled `A book of Bombay', first published in 1883 and reproduced in his bigger book `Bombay and Western Indian' published from London in 1893. Douglas visited the Raigad fort in 1883 and when he found the cenotaph (Samadhi) of Shivaji in a dilapidated

condition, the temple in a wretched plight, and the image therein thrown on the ground, pathetically observed, "Nobody now cares for Shivaji, not one rupee is spent on the annual repairs of the tomb of Shivaji Maharaj who was master of an enormous kingdom."

Douglas further urged the British Government, who had acquired the Kingdom of Shivaji and his successors to look into this matter, in a note in which he said, "The British Government conserves the architectural remains of Tudor and Stuarts. Will not the Bombay Government do as much for the tomb, the temple and the arch of Shivaji? A few crumbs that fall from the archaeological bureau of Western India would suffice to keep in repair memorials of a dashing and most romantic period."

The efforts of James Douglas, however, did not go in vain. In view of these remarks, and the pressure from the public, the British Government, not only declared it as a Monument of Protection but also made some provision for its repairs and maintenance.

The remarks of James Douglas about the neglect of the forts in general and Raigad in particular also created a stir in Maharashtra and both the press and the intellectuals resented the Government policy strongly. Raigad was made the symbol of patriotism, and people were reminded by the Press, as early as 1885, of their negligence of patriotism. Justice M.G. Ranade, the author of the famous classic `Rise of the Maratha Power' organised a public meeting at Hirabag in Pune in 1886 to promote interest in the issue of Shivaji Memorial. It was attended by many important people including the Maratha Sardars, Landlords and even the representative of the Kolhapur State.

Lokmanya Tilak being otherwise busy with several other issues including his own research in Vedic literature, perhaps, did not actively participate in the Shivaji Memorial issue. But an article in the Native opinion of V.N. Mandlik (1895) in which the author after personally visiting the Raigad fort concurred with James Douglas's views which were reproduced again in his book Bombay and Western India in 1893 about the deplorable condition of the shrine of Maharaja Shivaji at Raigad. This kindled the imagination

of Tilak and in his article in the Kesari of April 23, 1895 he condemned himself and the sardars and jagirdars for letting the samadhi to fall into decay. He wrote sarcastically, but the sardars and the chiefs knew that they are not likely to be benefited by Shivaji as he is dead and gone. This exhortation had its desired effect in attracting people from all strata of society and raising the funds for repairs, maintenance, a chhatri on the tomb, and annual birthday celebration. He made this a issue of national interest and gave to it the shape of a movement which was later on known as the Shivaji Movement which spread in the other parts of the country like Bengal, United Provinces, Assam and some places in the South as a political movement and a part of the India's struggle for freedom.

Tilak organised a public meeting on 30th May 1895 at Hirabag, Pune on the same lines as Justice Ranade had done in 1886. A Smarak Committee of 50 members including Tilak was appointed in this meeting to raise substantial funds for the Shivaji Memorial to give a fitting reply to the Bombay Government which had sanctioned a ridiculous grant of Rs. five per annum for the repairs and maintenance of the tomb of the Maratha Chhatrapati. This appeal touched the public and donations started pouring into the Memorial Fund from two annas of a student to one thousand of Maharaj Sayajirao Gaikwad of Baroda, and within a period of six months an amount to the tune of Rs. Nine thousand was collected.

In view of this unexpected response from the public it was decided that henceforth the birthday of Shivaji be celebrated on the Raigad fort itself, instead of the earlier practice of organising it at Mahad. The Committee also framed provisional rules to regulate celebrations to be held at Raigad from 1896 on a large scale, and published them in the Kesari (3rd March 1896).

Tilak had also planned to direct the attention of the National leaders and make the birthday celebrations of Shivaji, a national festival. He organised a meeting on 29th December 1895 at the Reay Market (now known as Phule Market) which was addressed by national leaders like Surendra Nath Banerjee, President of the Indian National Congress, and Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya.

Tilak had decided to hold the Birthday celebrations at Raigad with a double purpose, firstly to take the people to the fort and let them see for themselves the dilapidated position of the Shivaji Memorial and make them contribute generously to the Fund; and secondly, to declare that what government could not do, the people of Maharashtra will do i.e. the repairs and maintenance by raising funds.

Several objections were raised by the Government while granting permission to hold the function at Raigad. The proposal was rejected first on the ground that Raigad was a reserved forest area, and secondly by objecting to the Marathi term Yatra used in the letter of the organizers which was translated into English by the Oriental Translator to the Government as Fair, which was considered equivalent in English to Market and as per the provisions of the Markets and Fairs Act of 1862 for want of sufficient notice, the request of the organisers was turned down. The organisers substituted the word `Yatra' by `Utsava' and approached the Government again.

Tilak was an elected member of the Legislative Council of the Bombay Government since 1893. He arranged a personal interview with the Governor of Bombay who was holidaying in Mahabaleshwar in April 1896 and obtained the necessary permission from the Governor by promising him that no untoward incidents would take place during the course of the festival. Thus, with the explicit permission of the Government, the celebrations were held on 15th April 1896, as declared, and the National Festival of Shivajayanti was inaugurated with great pomp and splendour. The Kesari of 21st April 1896 reported that over 6000 persons from various places of Maharashtra had gathered on the fort to witness the festival and pay their humble homage to their great national hero. The press in general reported it as `the most glorious and successful function that was ever held at the Raigad fort.' Probably since the coronation of Shivaji which was held over 250 years ago, there had been no function similar to the one held this year.

The Government, however, was not prepared to express any opinion in favour or otherwise on this movement officially called `the Shivaji boom'. To Mr. Nugent, a member of the Council of Governor, `the entire agitation is purely a Brahmin move. The Marathas have held aloof' (25-7-1897).

Direct Contribution to Research

The initial success in celebrating the birthday of Shivaji, involved him in direct research in Maratha history, particularly regarding fixing the correct date and place of Shivaji's birth. As regards, the place of birth of Shivaji, all historians unanimously accepted the fort of Shivaneri as the place where Shivaji was born; but opinion was divided about the year and date of his birth - whether it was Vaishakha of Shaka 1549 (1627 AD) or Falgun of Shaka 1551 (1630 AD).

V. K. Rajwade, the doyen among the Maratha historians, in his introduction to the Marathyanchya Itihasachi Sadhane vol. IV published in 1900 discusses the issue of Shivaji's birthdate and on the basis of a chronological note submitted by one Kashinath Krishna Lele of Dhar (Dewas) in 1801 for publication in Kavyeitihas Samgraha periodical of K.N. Sane. This chronology of Dhar mentions that Shivaji was born on Monday, the Vaishakha Shudha Panchami of the Prabhav Samvatsar and the nakshatra (constellation) was Rohini. According to the English calender the birthday falls on 10th April 1627. Grant Duff denies it and says that Shivaji was born in the month May of the Year 1627 which is obviously not correct. He examined the bakhars (chronicles) saptaprakarnatmak Charitra of Shivaji by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis and Shivadigvijya (found in Baroda in 1818, written by an unknown author) suggesting Shaka 1549 Vaishakha Shudha Dwitiya, Thursday as the birthday of Shivaji, and rejected it on the ground that the Rohini nakshatra does not occur on Thursday. Rajwade doubts the motives of the chroniclers in advocating Vaishaka Dwitiya (7 April 1627) instead of Panchami. It was believed in those days that the king must be born on an auspicious day, and as Panchami did not fulfil that, they must have rejected it and conveniently fixed the birthdate on Dwitiya.

Tilak who was anxious to determine the exact birth date of Shivaji , was dragged into this birthday controversy by the above

mentioned Introduction of Rajwade. He elaborately examined this issue in his article in the Kesari of 24th April 1900. He read Rajwade's 140 pages long introduction, it seems and appreciated his efforts of collecting all available information and examining it scientifically and carefully and arriving at some conclusions after examining the contradictory views of scholars. He also hoped that Rajwade would continue his research and examine the controversial or doubtful issues and enlighten his readers by supplying proper information.

Tilak was amazed to see that there was lack of consistency in the chronicles and historical documents about the birth date of a person who was born some 275 years ago, and that five to six versions about his birth date differing in the shaka (year) or, samvatsar (era) or tithi (date). On the basis of information that was available for him he could only surmise that most of the sources agree only on the month of birth, i.e. vaishakha but not with the date and other details, and therefore, he says, one can arrive at a proper decision only after critically examining all the issues involved in it.

Tilak critically examined nearly fourteen sources of information, contemporary and of little later period produced between 17th and early 19th century. They included poetic works like Shivaraj Bhushan or Shiva-Bhavani of a contemporary Hindi poet Bhushan of the North India, Shivakaya by Purushottam, bakhars like Sabhasadi, Citnisi, Chitragupta, Rairi, Shivadgvijaya, Shivapratap, Marathi Samrajyachi Choti Bakhar, 91 Qalimi bakhar, Panditrao bakhar, Pratinidhi bakhar, a chronological note from Dhar and horoscope published in Kavyeitihas Samgraha a periodical of K.N. Sane, and a chronology of the Chhatrpatis published in the Bharatvarsha periodical of D.B. Parasnis. This long list of sources alone is enough to show the deep interest taken by Tilak to establish a single point, namely the birth date of Shivaji.

He did not find a single correct date in all these sources which would fulfil all the tests of astronomical calculations. Out of the 14 sources, 9 give 11 different dates, and the remaining five are

unanimous on one date but it does not pass the test of astronomy. He thus came to the conclusion that there are four major versions found in these sources and one has to decide the exact date of birth only after examining them. These probable four dates are :

1. Shaka 1549, Prabhav, Vaishakah Shudha 2, Saturday (7th April 1627)
2. Shaka 1549, Prabhav, Vaishakha Shudha 5, Tuesday (10th April 1627)
3. Shaka 1548, Kshaya, Samvatsar, Vaishakh 2, Monday (17th April 1626)
4. Shaka 1548, Kshaya, Vaishakha Shudha 5, Thursday (20th April 1626)

In these four versions, the month Vaishakha is common in all, but there is a difference in the tithi or day. As regards the difference in the year, Tilak rejects the year 1548 on the basis of the references to the date of his death which was shaka 1602, Chaitra Shudha 15, Sunday (4th April 1680) as all sources were unanimous on it, and after calculating the span of the career of Shivaji, he fixed the year 1549 as the year of birth.

He finally accepted a date which was nearer to the bakhar than that of Rajwade and it was Shaka 1549, Pravhav Samvatsar, Vaishakha Shudha Pratipada (nor 2nd or 5th Thursday, Ashwinin nakshatra (not Rohini) equivalent to 6th April 1627. However, he confessed that there was good deal of confusion regarding the date of birth of Shivaji, and appealed to the research scholars to express their views on this issue which he would gladly publish in his newspaper. He requested the organizers of the birthday celebrations to be held on Vaishakha Shudha pratipada from 1900 onwards.

The year and month, thus continued to be followed by the people for a fairly long time till new sources came forward. In the subsequent years two major sources namely the Jedhe Shakavali and the Sanskrit epic Shiva Bharat and epic composed by Kavindra Paramanand the poet laureate of Shivaji. However, when Tilak wrote the article in 1900 non of these sources of information were

available to him. His search for getting an authentic source continued and he succeeded in laying his hands on the Jedhe Shakavali which he secured from Daji Saheb Jedhe Deshmukh of Kari (Bhor princely state) by 1906-7 but could not find enough time to analyse it and so published it as he found it with a brief note, in the journal of the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal (BISM) in 1916. The other source i.e. Shivabharat came to light only in 1927, which confirmed the date given in the Jedhe Shakavali. A learned research scholar Dattopant Vinayak Apte of the BISM considered afresh in the light of these two new sources and rejected the findings of both Rajwade and Tilak, and declared Shaka 1551, Shukla Samvatsar, Falgun Vadya Tritiya, Friday, nakshtra, hasta, equivalent to 19th February 1630, as the correct date of Shivaji's birth. For a long time historians like G.S. Sardesai, Jadunath Sarkar and others, however did not accept the date advocated by the BISM, and the celebrations continued to be held at two different dates. After the information of Samyukta Maharashtra, the Government appointed a Committee of historians in 1960 to give a finality to this long pending controversy. But the majority decision of the committee submitted in 1966 was not implemented by the Government till February 2000, and now it is officially declared that Falgun Vadya Tritiya of Shaka 1551 (1630 AD) approved by the majority and advocated by the BISM as the authentic date for the celebration of Shiva Jayanti. Thus after nearly hundred years i.e. since Tilak wrote his article in April 1900, the controversy is now resolved. Tilak must get credit for this.

Tilak wrote a number of articles on Shivaji and other historical matters connected with Maharashtra since 1895 practically till the end of his life in 1920. During his long imprisonment at Mandalay (1908-1914) it is discovered from his note book, among other things, like history of Hinduism, Indian nationality, Hindu law, Geeta Rahasya, etc. he had even planned to write a biography of Shivaji. He also jotted down the purpose of his Shiva Charitra. According to him, Shivaji did not establish Maratha power for self but for the people of Maharashtra as a whole; his example was emulated by Peshwa Bajirao I, who by elevating Shinde, Holkar, Gaikwad, to the status of Maratha Sardars tried to show that this

Maratha nation was for all. The lesson which Shivaji's life teaches, according to Tilak, was that leaders should not exploit caste, emphasis should be on talent and quality irrespective of the individual's social status.

INDIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY

Tilak believed that the historical research should be the first duty of any emerging nation. In his article in the Kesari of 9th May 1915, he applauded the selfless efforts of Sane, Khare, Rajwade and Parasnis in promoting historical research in Maharashtra. He appealed to the younger generation that they should emulate the example of these pioneers, who have sown the seeds of historical research in this land. He warned them in these words, "Your ancestry lost the kingdom; if you lose history, your progeny will lose its dharma i.e. duty; Maharashtra will not only be forgotten, but will be destroyed completely; you should try to avoid this calamity."

He gave opportunities to many scholars to publish their researches, or controversial issues, in the Kesari or the Mhratta and thus encouraged public debate. Rajwade, Khare, Parasnis, Bhanu, Paranjape, Jinsiwale and many others responded to this appeal of Lokmanya.

Tilak had to face many objections raised by his enemies against the Shivaji Movement which he had launched on a mass scale since 1895-96. It was considered by some as a movement not for renovation of Shivaji Memorial, but to establish Shivaji as an incarnation of God; an anonymous person called himself as Historicus, in an article in the Times of India 1899 said, "Shivaji's Raj was destroyed by the Brahmins and they are the leaders now to revive his Raj". To Tilak, according to some, Shivaji was not an academic issue but a political one causing Hindu-Muslim riots.

Lokmanya Tilak strongly refuted all these charges levelled against him. To him, Shivaji was not a god, but a superman, appears every now on this earth, as per sermons of Geeta Sambhavami Yuge Yuge, to surmount the difficulties of humanity. Shivaji is remembered for his nation building activities; biographies

of great leaders like Shivaji, are the sources of inspiration to the younger generation.

To those who found fault with the brahmin leadership of the movement and doubted that it might be reduced to Ramnavami festival in the long run, Tilak gave fitting reply in his article Shivaji and Brahmin by citing many examples from history, and charged the critics that their main purpose in calling it a brahmin movement was to create a rift between the Brahmins and the non-Brahmans of Maharashtra.

To the charge that the two festivals namely the Ganesh (1893) and Shivaji (1896) caused Hindu-Muslim riots of 1893, 1894, 1896 in Maharashtra, Tilak gave a strong reply in his article in the Mhratta of June 24, 1906. Shivaji he declared, was not an enemy of the Muslims. Had there been a Muslim in his place under those circumstances, he too would have been honoured. Who was he? Where was he born? are minor issues. One who inspires is great. We are not against a festival being started in favour of Akbar or any other Hero from old Indian History....It is a sheer misrepresentation to suppose that the worship of Shivaji includes invocation to fight either with the Mohamedans or with the Government.

In support of the Shivaji festival, Tilak argued that man had become an animal, and Shivaji made him a human being with a desire to be free, and realize that swarajya was his fundamental right. He, therefore, believed that the purpose of Shivaji festival was promotion of patriotism and nationalism among the people of this country.

Once, a young historian, D.V. Apte, to whom a reference has been made earlier, asked Tilak, "My friends say that all research in History is useless and unnecessary; one would hardly get anything out of it, it is a sheer waste of time, and a great headache, so give it up and do something concrete."

Lokmanya replied, "Listen to your friends and do what you want to do with all might and determination. Research cannot be done by all, it is a privilege of the chosen few. It depends on one's liking and aptitude. Research should be done for the sake of

research only. One cannot show the tangible results of historical research immediately. But research is such a thing which should not be avoided by one who is interested in it. Every activity should not be motivated by material gain. Man works both for his maintenance as well as for satisfying his urge for pure knowledge. It depends on the nature and character of man, to which he should give priority. One can hardly explain to a common man the ecstasy one gets through research resulting in the advancement of knowledge."

This summarizes Tilak's views on historical research. For want of time Lokmanya Tilak could not pay much attention to historical research but he knew the relevance of history, and how to reconcile historical research for political purposes, as well as for advancement of knowledge, and therefore, his contribution to historical research deserves attention of scholars and political leaders of modern times.

CONGRESS ITS GENESIS

The 1857 revolt was suppressed. The British Empire in India was saved, Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India and the new policy was ushered in. It was even more reactionary and in the long run proved very harmful. The native princes were now to be used as British tools and propped as bulwark against forces of resistance and progress. Government was no longer to encourage social reform. The benign rule was thus to carefully preserve decaying aristocracies, superstition and warring dogmas and cults. These were to provide the pattern for British imperialism with its foundations laid deep in the religious differences, caste and untouchability and the feudal states and the aristocracy.

Economic and Political Discontent

The policy of economic exploitation, however, became even worse though more subtle, Mass unrest was the inevitable result of the ever growing poverty and helplessness of the peasantry.

The common people, Hindus and Muslims, struggled against the terrible oppression, wherever they could and with whatever weapons they could muster. There was a new English educated

class which was used to run the Government machinery. I was great admirer of everything Western which lent its support to the Government.

The belief of the educated classes in the English tradition of liberal thought and institutions received setbacks as a result of various Government measures. The Freedom of the press, introduced earlier by Metcalfe was soon done away with. The vernacular Press was gagged in 1878 and the Bengali Amrita Bazar Patrika had to change overnight into an English garb. The Arms Act was passed in 1879. This disillusionment advanced further when the filbert Bill to abolish "judicial discrimination, based, on racial distinction" had to be virtually dropped on accounts of fierce opposition by the European community and the Civil Service. The Europeans did not hesitate to threaten the Viceroy, Lord Ripon, with violence if the Bill was passed. Indians learned the' lesson at time. In 1853 the first Cotton Mill was established in Bombay. The number of mills rose to 156 by 1880. This was an alarming progress and under pressure of Lancashire, all duties on cotton imports into India were removed in 1882.

Social Renaissance

It was not merely the economic exploitation and the sense of political subjection that gave birth to the Congress. For fifty years and more before the birth of the Congress, the leaven of national rejuvenation had been at work. In fact national life was in a state of ferment as early as in the times of Rammohan Roy, who could in a w be regarded as the prophet of Indian Nationalism and the father of modern India. He has a wide vision and a broad outlook. While it is in that the socio-religious condition of his day was the subject of his special attention in his reformist activities, he nevertheless a keen sense of the grave political wrongs by which his country was afflicted at that time and made a strenuous effort to seek an early redress of those wrongs. Rammohan Roy was born in 1776 and passed away at Bristol in 1883. His name is associated with two great reforms in India, namely, the abolition of Sati and the introduction of western learning in the country. In the closing period of his life he chose to Visit England and his

passion for liberty was so great that when he reached the Cape of Good Hope he insisted on his being carried to a French vessel where he the flag of liberty flying, so that he might be able to do homage to that flag, and when he saw the flag he shouted, "Glory, Glory, Glory to the Flag." Although he had gone to England primarily as the ambassador of the Moghul Emperor to plead his cause in London, yet he took the opportunity to place some of the pressing Indian grievances before a Committee of the House of Commons. He submitted three papers, on the Revenue system of India, the Judicial system of India, and the Material condition of India. He was honoured by the East India Company with a public dinner. When in 1832 the Charter Act was before Parliament he vowed that if the Bill was not passed he would give up his residence in the British dominion and reside in America.

The Universities were established in 1858 and the High Courts and the Legislative Councils in India between 1861and 1963 Just before the "mutiny", the "Widow Re-marriage Act" was passed as also the Act relating to conversion into Christianity. In the sixties of the nineteenth century, an intimate contact was established with Western learning and literature, Western legal institutions and Parliamentary methods were inaugurated, to mark a new era in the field of law and legislation. The impact of Western civilization on the East could not hut leave a deep impress upon the beliefs and sentiments of the Indian people who came directly under its influence.

The only parts of the country which had received some education on modern, lines were the provinces of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. The number of educated men even in these provinces was small. In the work of settlement that followed the mutiny, these educated men found ample scope for their ambition. These races of Babus began to think like their English masters, admired and emulated everything that came from the West.

Soon, however, there was a reaction against this process of denationalisation which assumed various forms, some of a synthesis of the West and the East and others of a revivalism going to the past.

Brahmo Samaj and Prarthana Samaj

The germs of religious reform planted in the days of Rammohan Roy became widespread Keshab Chandra Sen on whose shoulders fell the mantle of Rammohan Roy spread the gospel of the Brahmo Samaj far and wide and gave a new social orientation to its tenets. He turned his attention to the temperance movement and. made common cause with the temperance reformers in England. He was largel responsible for the passing of the Civil Marriage Act III of 1872.

The Brahmo Samaj of Bengal had it's repercussions all over the country. In Poona, the movement assumed the name of Prarthana Samaj under the leadership of MG. Ranade, who, it will be remembered was the founder of the Social Reform movement which for long years continued to be an adjunct of the Congress. One feature, however, to this reformist movement was a certain disregard for the past and a spirit of revolt from the time-honoured and traditional beliefs of the country, which arose from au undue glamour presented by the Western institutions and heightened greatly by the political prestige associated with them.

Arya Samaj

The Arya Sarnaj in the North West founded by the venerable Swami Dayanand Saraswati, and the Theosophical movement from the South furnished the necessary corrective to the spirit of heterodoxy and even heresy which the Western learning brought with it. Both of them were intensely nationalistic movements, only the Arya Samaj movement which owed its birth to the inspiration of the great Dayanand Saraswati was aggressive in its patriotic zeal, and while holding fast to the cult of the infallibility of the Vedas and the superiority of and the infallibility of the Vedic culture was at the same time not inimical to broad social reform. It thus developed a virile manhood in the Nation which was the synthesis of what is best in its heredity, with what is best in its environment. It fought some of the prevailing social evils and religious superstitions in Hinduism as much as the Brahmo Samnaj had battle against polytheism, idolatry amid polygamy.

Theosophical Movement

The Theosophical movement while it extended its studies and sympathies to the wide world, laid special emphasis on a rediscovery as well as a rehabilitation of all that was great and glorious in the culture, It was this passion that led Mrs. Besant to start a college in Benares, the holy cit of India. The Theosophical activities, while developing a spirit of international brotherhood, helped to check that sense of rationalist superiority of the West and planted anew a cultural centre in India which attracted the savants amid scholars of the West once again to this ancient land.

Ramakrishna Mission

The latest phase of nation renaissance in India prior to the Congress was inaugurated in Bengal by that great sage, Ram Krishana Paramhansh, who later found in Swami Vivekanand his chief apostle carrying his gospel to East and West. The Ramakrishna Mission is not merely an organisation wedded to occultism or realism, but to a profound transcendentalism which, however, does not ignore the supreme duty of "Loke-Sangraha" or social service.

This "Cyclonic Hindu", as Vivekananda was called in America, carried the message of India not only to America or Europe, Egypt, China and Japan but was himself influenced greatly by the West and preached a dynamic new gospel of regeneration in India, from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas. He stressed on the necessity for liberty amid equality and the raising of the masses. He wanted to combine he Western progress with Indian spiritual background. The one constant refrain of his speech and writing was Abhay "Be fearless, be strong for weakness is sin, weakness is death."

A contemporary of Vivekananda and yet belonging to a much more later generation was Rabindranath Tagore. The Tagore family played a great part in various reform movements during the 19th Century in Bengal. It gave us Abhindranath Tagore and others,, great spiritual leaders and artists. The influence of Tagore over the mind of India and the stamp that he has left in the domain

of literature, poetry, drama, music, soci4l and educational reconstruction and political thought is unsurpassed .in its beauty and depth. It is a marvel of human personality and mind affecting and giving colour to successive generations. The contribution of Tagore has been of a synthesis of the East and West, of the modern and the ancient and of the international with the national tide in the country.

These currents and movements were the real, lifeblood of the new national consciousness, urge and their embodiment that took shape partly and developed from, stage to stage in the form of the Indian National Congress.

THE IDEA OF AN ALL-INDIA ORGANISATION

The credit for the birth of the Congress is often sought to be given to A/art Octavian Hume, who with the' blessings 'of the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, inaugurated it. The British are thus said to be the foster parents of the Indian nationalism. It is true that Hume was the organiser of the Congress Session in 1885. But it will be seen that the Congress was the natural and inevitable production of various political, economic and social forces.

The more alert among the English administrators were not unaware of the rising unrest in the country. "A reckless bureaucratic Government sat at this time trembling upon the crumbling fragments of a mendacious budget on the one side on the sheathing and surging discontent of multitudinous, population on the other". Mr. Hume collected widespread evidence of the imminence of a "terrible revolution" by the half-starved and desperate population and set about to find ways and means of direction the popular impulse into an innocuous channel.

He wrote a letter to "Graduates of Calcutta University" on March 1, 1883 and the "Indian National Union" was formed in 1884, in response to this, for constitutional agitation, on au all-India basis, and was to meet in Poona later. The Government who first patronised this organisation, however, found later that it outgrew their plans and the patronage was soon withdrawn. It came to be called the 'factory of sedition' in a few years and later

Lord Dufferin himself tried to twit it as a body representing "microscopic minority" of India's population.

There were various provincial political organisations that preceded the Congress. In Bengal which was at the vanguard of progress at this time, in 1843 was founded the British Indian Society to be merged later into the British Indian Association. This body had such stalwarts as Rajendralal Mitra, Ramgopal Ghosh, Peary Chand Mitter and Harish Chandra Mukherjee. In Bombay there was the Bombay Association with Jaggannath Sankerset, Dadabhai Naoroji, V.N, Mandlik and Nowrosjee Furdunjec.

Later, more popular bodies, the Indian Association in Bengal and Sarvajanika Sabha in Poona, under Ranade and 1ahajauia Sabha in Madras were established. Surendranath 'Bannerjee went on an all India tour in 1877 and succeeding years and carried a campaign about Indian Home Rule and the political questions of the day. He attended the Delhi Durbar that year, and the idea of an all-India political organisation was mooted there.

In December 1884, the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society was held at Madras and there some leading public men met and decided to inaugurate an all India national movement.

Thus, the ground was well prepared for the Government to take the initiative and the credit of forming the National Congress and keep it under control.

Early Phase of the Congress

The Indian National movement was primarily a movement for freedom from alien domina-nation. The movement has been one comprehensive effort embracing all aspects of the life of the community. The birth of the Indian National Congress, perhaps the oldest and the biggest democratic organisation in the world, did not take place in an atmosphere of a fanfare of trumpets nor did it create a stir by passing flamboyant resolutions.

Hume's Initiative

In 1884, at the annual convention of the Theosophical Society at Adyar in Madras, Mr. Allan Octavian Hume laid bare to his

friends his plan to organise the Congress. A committee was formed to make the necessary prepara tions for a session at Poona to be held in 1885.

The committee consisted of Mr. Hume, Mr. Surendra Nath Bannerji, Mr. Narendranath Sen, Mr. S. Subrarnania Iyer, Mr. P. Ananda Charlu, Mr. V.N. Mandalik, Mr.K.T. Telag, Sardar Dayal Singh, Lala Sri Ram.

Mr Hume, still a government servant, addressed an "Resolutions" that were passed on what were thought to open letter to the graduates of Calcutta University with a fervent appeal for self help.

He said "and if even the leaders of thought are all years, excepting 'agitation' on these resolutions in India either such poor creatures, or so selfishly wedded to and in England personal concern, that they dare not strike a blow for their country's sake, then justly and rightly they are kept down and trampled on, for they deserve nothing better. Every nation secures precisely as good a government as it merits, If you the picked men, the most highly. educated of the nation cannot, scorning personal ease and selfish objects, make a resolute struggle to secure greater freedom for yourselves and your country, a more impartial administration, a larger share in the management of your own affairs then we, your friends are wrong and our adversaries right, then Lord Rippon's noble aspirations for your good are fruitless and visionary, then at present at any rate, all hopes of progress are at an end, and India truly neither lacks nor deserves any better government than she enjoys.

"Only if this be so, let us hear no more factious, peevish complaints that you are kept in strings and treated like children, for you will have proved yourself such, Men know how to act. Let there be no more complaints of Englishmen being preferred to you ill all important offices, for if you lack that public spirit, that highest form of altruistic devotion that leads men to subordinate private case to the public weal that patriotism that has made Englishmen what they are-then rightly are these preferred to you, rightly and inevitably have they become your rulers.. And rulers and task masters they must continue let the yoke gall your shoulders never so sorely, until you realise and stand prepared to act upon the eternal truth that self-sacrifice and unselfish ness are the only unfailing guide to freedom and happiness."

The First Session

The first session, of the Congress was to meet at Poona hut owing to an outbreak of cholera the venue was shifted to Bombay and the session began on the 28th December 1885, with Mr. W. C. Bnnerjee, the doyen of the Calcutta Bar in the chair, though originally, it had been decided to request Lord Reay, Governor of Bombay, to be the first President of the Indian National Congress but the idea had to be dropped as the Governor was advised by the Viceroy not to accept the offer. 72 delegates came from different parts of the country and most important among them were Dadabhai Naoroji, Ranade, Pherozeshah Mehta K.T. Telang, Dinshaw Wacha, etc. The meeting was truly a national gathering consisting of leading men from all parts of India.

The president defined the objective of the Congress as "promotion of personal intimacy and friendship among all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the parts of the empire and eradication of race, creed or provincial prejudice and fuller development of national unity." In its early sessions, the Congress Organisation, by and large, limited its activities only to debates.

After the Madras Session in 1887, an aggressive propaganda was started among the masses. Hume published a pamphlet entitled "An Old Man's Hope" in which he appealed to the people of England in these words: "Ah men, well-fed and happy, do you at all realise the dull misery of these countless myriads? From their births to their deaths, how many rays of sunshine think you chequer their gloom-shrouded paths? Toil, toil, toil; hunger, hunger, hunger, sickness, suffering, sorrow; these alas, alas, alas are the keynotes of their short and sad existence.

In December 1889, the Congress Session was held at Bombay under the Presidentship of Sir William Wedderburn. It was

attended by Charles Bradlaugh, a member of British Parliament He addressed the Congress in words; "For whom should I work if not for the people? Born of the people, trusted by the people, I will die for the people, and I know no geographical or race limitation."

Dadabhai Naoroji was re-elected as the President of the Lahore Session of the Congress held in December 1893, His journey from Bombay to Lahore presented the spectacle of a procession, and Citizens at various places on the way presented him addresses. At the Golden Temple at Amritsar, he was given a robe of honour. Addressing the audience at the Session, Dadabhai Naoraji declared: "Let us, always remember that we are children of our mother country. Indeed, I have never worked in any other spirit than that I am an Indian and owe duty to my work and all my countrymen. Whether I am a Hindu or a Mohammedan, a Parsi, a Christian, or of any other creed, Tam above all an Indian. Our country is I our nationality is Indian."

The Moderates

The early Congressmen who dominated the affairs of the Indian National Congress from 1885, to 1905 were known as the Moderates. They belonged to a class which was Indian in blood and colour but British in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. They were supporters of British institutions. They believed that what India needed was a balanced and lucid presentation of her needs before the Englishmen and their Parliament. They had faith in the British sense of justice and fairplay.

The Moderates believed in orderly progress and constitutional agitation. They believed in patience, steadiness, conciliation and union. To quote Surendarnath Banerjee, "The triumphs of liberty are not to be won in a day. Liberty is a jealous goddess, exacting in her worship and claiming from her votaries prolonged and assiduous devotion." In 1887, Badruddin Tyabji observed: "Be moderate in your demands just in your criticism, correct in your facts and logical in your conclusions."

The Moderates believed in constitutional agitation within the four corners of law. They believed that their main task was to

educate the people, to arouse national political consciousness and to create a united public, opinion on political questions. For this purpose they held meetings. They criticised the Government through the press. They drafted and submitted memorials and petitions to the- Government, to the officials of the. Government of India and also to the British Parliament. They also worked to influence the British Parliament and British public opinion. The object of the memorials and petitions was to enlighten the British public and political leaders about the conditions prevailing in India. Deputations of leading Indian leaders were sent to Britain in 1889. A British Committee of the Indian National Congress was founded in 1906 and that Committee started a journal called India. Dadabhai Naoroji spent a major part of his life and income in Britain doing propaganda among its people and politicians.

The object before the Moderates was "wide employment of Indians in higher offices in the public service and the establishment of representative institutions."

The economic and political demands of the Moderates were formulated with a view to unifying the Indian people on the basis of a common political programme. They organised a powerful all-India agitation against the abandonment of tariff-duties on imports and against the imposition of cotton excise duties. This agitation aroused the feelings of the people and helped them to realise the real aims and purposes of British rule in India. They urged the Government to provide cheap credit to the peasantry through agricultural banks and to make avail able irrigation facilities on a large scale. They asked for improvement in the conditions of work of the plantation labourers, a radical change in the existing pattern of taxation and expenditure which put a heavy burden on the poor while leaving the rich, especially the foreigners, with a very light load.

The Moderates complained of India's growing poverty and economic backwardness and put all the blame on the policies of the British Government. They criticised the individual administrative measures and worked hard to reform the administrative system.

The Moderates opposed tooth and nail the restrictions imposed by the Government on the freedom of speech and the press. In 1897, Tilak and many other leaders were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for spreading disaffection against the Government through their speeches and writings. The Natu brothers of Poona were deported without trial. The arrest of Tilak marked the beginning of a new phase of the Nationalist movement. The Amrita Bazar Patrika wrote: "There is scarcely a home in this vast country where Tilak is not now the subject of melancholy talk and where his imprisonment is not considered as a domestic calamity."

The basic weakness of the Moderates lay in their narrow social base. Their movement did not have a wide appeal. The area of their influence was limited to the urban community. As they 1id not have the support of the masses, they declared that the time was not ripe for throwing out a challenge to the foreign rulers. To quote Gokhale, "You do not realise the enormous reserve of power behind the Government. If the Congress were to do anything such as you suggest, the Government would have no difficulty in throttling it in five minutes." However, it must not be presumed that the Moderate leaders fought for their narrow interests. Their pro-grammes and policies championed the cause of all sections of the Indian people and represented nation-wide interests against colonial exploitation. What they wanted was to reform or liberalise the existing system of government through peaceful, gradualist and constitutional means.

The influence of the moderates, however, declined with the rise of the militants who did not believe in gradualism and who criticized the moderates for their great faith in Britain and British political institutions.

Rise of Extremism

TIme moderates sought to make time provincial legislatures more representative and to increase the Indian element in the civil services, but the process was long and the progress slow slow, Repelled by the unsympathetic approach of the imperial bureaucracy and enraged by he unpopular policies of Lord Curzon,

the Viceroy, and particularly his decision on the partition of Bengal, the youth of India moved towards militant politics and direct action. As a protest against the partition of Bengal (October 1905), the nationalists advocated the boycott of British goods.

In 1907, Bipin Pal made the paradoxical statement that the "viceroyalty of Lord Curzon…. had been one of the most beneficent if not decidedly the most beneficent viceroyalty that India ever had," for Curzon, by pursuing his unpopular policies, had made Indians SO discontented that they demanded self-government with greater determination than ever before. Aurobindo similarly declared that he considered the partition of Bengal to be a most beneficial measure because, by arousing intense opposition among the people, that measure had stirred up and strengthened national feeling.

As a result of the growing disillusionment about the activities of the British rulers and as a reaction against Curzon's proposal for the partition of Bengal there came into existence the extremist part which advocated a policy of boycott, swadeshi and national education in January 1907, Tilak declared: ''We are not armed, and there is no necessity of arms either. We have a stronger weapon, a political weapon in boycott.'' Tilak also said: "When you prefer to accept swadeshi, you must bycott videshi (foreign) goods. Without boycott, swadeshi cannot flourish.''

Aurbindo Tilak and Pal asked the people not to cooperative with the government. The basic theory of Tilak, Aurbindo and Pal, which was later put into operation a mass scale by Mahatmna Gandhi, was that as the existence of the Government depended on he cooperation of the people, the Government would cease to function or to exist the very day the people withdrew their Cooperation from it.

With the rise of the militant movement the glamour of England and English institutions began to fade and English influence increasingly came to be replaced by the influence emanating primarily from the indigenous sources as also from the European literature or revolt. The study of British constitutional history had generated among the moderates a love for and faith in Dominion

status. But such stories as how the Italians had driven the Austrians out of their land gave militant nationalists a new conception and in fact a new ideal of complete independence. Self-government under British promontory had been the goal of the moderate school, but the ideal of extremist or militant school was complete autonomy and elimination of all foreign control.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920) and other extremist o wanted to adopt a policy of direct act and sistance, denounced what they called "the political mendicancy" of the moderates. During the anti partition agitation, in the first decade of the twentieth century Tilak wrote: "The time has come to demand Swaraj or self Government. No piecemeal reform will do. The system of the present administration is ruinous to the country. It must mend or end." According to him Swaraj was the birthright of every Indian.

"The term Swaraj," said Bipin Pal (1858-1932), another exremist leader, was not merely a political but primarily a moral concept. "The corresponding term in our language," he said, "is not non-subjection which would be a literal rendering of the English word independence, but self-subjection which is a positive concept. Self- subjection means.... complete identification of the individual with the universal."

Another Swarajist leader who, like Tilak, spoke of the ideal of Swaraj, was Aurobindo Ghose (1872-1950). "We of the new school, "he said, "would not pitch our ideal one inch lower than absolute Swaraj-Self-Government as it exists in the United Kingdom." And he added, "We reject the claim of aliens to force upon us a civilisation inferior to our own or keep us out of our inheritance on the untenable ground of a superior fitness."

Lajpat Rai (1865-1928), along with Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Pal, constituted the swarajist triumvirate called "Lal-Bal-Pal". Lajpat, like the other extremists, believed that India must rely oil her own strength amid should not look to Britain for help.

The swarajist said that however much Britain's rule might be improved or liberalised, it could never be as beneficial to Indians as the self-rule. Their attitude was the same as that of the Irish Sinn Fein leader Arthur Griffith, who had said: I"…in those who talk of ending British misgovernment we See the helots. It is not British misgovernment, but British government in Ireland, good or bad, we stand opposed to." The swarajists accordingly considered that freedom was their birthright.

The Surat Split

In 1907, there was a split in the Congress and the Moderates parted company with the Extremists. That split was due to many causes. The moderates had controlled the Congress from its very beginning and even now they were ill control of it. They had their own ways of thinking and which were not acceptable to the younger generation who were impatient with the speed at which the Moderates were moving and leading the nation. Under the circumstances, a confrontation between the two was inevitable and that actually happened in 1907.

The seeds of the split could be traced to the Calcutta Session in 1906, where the Moderates had accepted the resolutions on Swaraj, national education, boycott and Swadeshi on account of the pressure brought of them from all quarters. In their hearts, they had not accepted the new resolutions. Their fear was that the growing pace of the national struggle might lead to lawlessness and that would provide the British with an excuse to deny the reforms on the one hand and to crush all political activity on the other. They had no self-confidence. They did not believe that sustained and dignified national struggle was possible and desirable. They considered the Extremists irresponsible persons who were likely to put in danger the future of the country. The British Government also tried to win over the Moderates against the Extremists. While the Extremists were roughly handled by the Government, the Moderates were shown all the favours. Lala Lajpat Rai, Sardai Ajit Singh, Tilak and man leaders of Bengal were deported.

The break-up of the Surat Congress was no doulbt au unpleasant affair. It marked a direct open breach between the Moderates and the Nationalist parties not only in Maharashtra but throughout India. For the first time in the history of the Congress, there was at Surat an open fight between the delegates

of the Congress and sonic blood was drawn, but it did not stop at that. The split led to a cleavage in the sense that the name of the Indian National Congress had to be kept in abeyance for the time and a new entity called he convention was installed in its place. Of course as the name itself implies, the Convention was a stop-gap expedient, intended to function in the place of the Congress only till such time as the national Congress could meet again in its old form. The old form had this peculiarity that there was not much ceremony observed in the election oft he delegates to the Congress. There were no conditions of membership. There was no constitution as such for the Congress, no election of delegates. In fact the membership was open to anyone that might choose to attend the Congress session as a delegate. There was no competition as such in the election of the delegates for the simple reason that there was no numerical allotment fixed for an province, it was an open rally of all that chose to attend.

Tilak and his party were of course ousted from the Convention because they would not sign a prescribed creed of political faith, which practically excluded the ideal of independence, if only an ideal so far. The Convention and the Nationalist party met in two separate camps at Surat. It must be noted here that even with this definite split in the Congress each party duly affirmed its love for the Congress which alone was regarded as the true national Assembly for the country and in both the camps the hope was expressed that sooner or later there might again be held a Congress united as before.

Nobody could openly allege the break-up of the Congress as a criminal offence, but the split was taken into consideration by the government as an open challenge to the policy of constitutional agitation. After Tilak's conviction by the High Court, the National party led by him became sullen and almost went underground. For six years from 1908 to 1914, the Nationalist Party could not decide as to what it should do about entering the Congress. There was an attempt made to call a meeting of a rival Congress at Nagpur. But while government banned the session, there was also want of unanimity in the party itself about the starting of a rival Congress which might make the split absolutely permanent. The

cooler wings in the Party thought that there was no wisdom in setting up a rival to the old Congress as without unity among political parties the show as presented by separate parties was bound to be poor. A group within the Tilak Party was trying to negotiate matters with the leaders of the Moderate party for making the entry of this group and others of its persuasion into the Congress on its own terms, that is to say, without the restriction of a creed and with the old facilities for unfettered election of delegates. But the other view was more insistent and prevailed, namely, that nothing should be done in this matter until Tilak returned from Mandalay.

Tilak's Loyal Attitude

Things came to a head after his return, It was soon discovered that Tilak was against setting up of a rival Congress though b this tune it was also discovered that the Moderate party had a very poor following in t lie Congress, so much so that the total number of delegates of the Congress at one tune did not mount to even 350, though the session was held under the presidency of such an illustrious personage as Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and also held in the vantage ground of northern. India. This loyal attitude of Tilak towards the Congress was well-known to the Moderates but was not appreciated by them. In fact, they resisted by every means in their power, all efforts made by Tilak and his friends to re enter the Congress.

Both Tilak and Mrs. Besant ioined hands and two Home Rule Leagues were formed, one in Maharashtra and the other in Madras. By the time of the Lucknow Congress in 1916, most of the open sores were healed. There was an urge in the mind of both Parties towards re union on honourable conditions. Some conditions about the membership of the Congress were agreed to, and the Moderate Party opened its arms to the Nationalist Party. Tilak attended the Lucknow Congress after an absence of 8 years and was given the honours of the one and sole political hero of the time. It must also be mentioned that the Moderate group in the Congress could not yet make up its mind to instal Tilak as the president of the Congress. But it was well-know that Tilak never

hankered after this honour. On the contrary, he was determined to practise an ordinance of self-denial in this matter, for it was well-know that though elected president of the Congress which was to have been, but was not held, in 1907, in Nagpur by the Reception Committee at Nagpur, Tilak withdrew his name and suggested that of Lala Lajpat Rai in his own place. For two years however, that is to say, in 1916 and 1917, Tilak was of course the leading figure at the annual Congress session and also at the special session held at Bombay. It was practically on the eve of Tilak's departure for England for the prosecution of the Chirol case, that he was elected to the presidentship of the Congress, but he was of course unable to accept it for he was given a passport to England only for the Chirol case and it was not expected that he could find time to devote' to politics during his stay in England.

He resigned it since it was of no practical use to him for some time. But he carried with him the capacity of the president of the Tilak Home Rule League and gave evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee on Montague's Government of India Bill, as the Chirol case was disposed off and there was an open invitation by the British Government to all Indian political parties to send delegations to England for the purpose. The last thing to be mentioned in connection with relations between Tilak and the Congress is the collection of a crore of rupees by Mahatma Gandhi' in the name of the Tilak Swaraj Fund, though it must also be mentioned that this Fund was spent on activities and propaganda to which Tilak could not be supposed to have given his cordial approval, namely the non-co operation policy and the cult of Ahinsa as a political weapon.

The Home Rule Movement

When Great Britain was involved in the First World War, Indian leaders like Tilak and Annie Besant decided to put new life in the national movement in the country. As the Englishmen did not like the word Swaraj and considered the same to be "seditious and dangerous," Tilak decided to use the term "Home Rule" in place of Swaraj as the goal of his movement. In December 1915, he had deliberations with his colleagues and on 28 April

1916 the Indian Home Rule League was set up with its headquarters at Poona. The object of this League was to "attain Home Rule or self-government within the British Empire by all constitutional means and to educate and organise public opinion in the country towards the attainment of the same." A similar Home Rule League was founded by Annie Besant on 15 September 1916 with its headquarters at Adyar near Madras.

The advocates of the Hone Rule Movement believed' in Constitutional methods and were opposed to violence and revolutionary agitation. The had no desire to embarrass the British Government which was fighting against Germany and Austria-Hungary. They were prepared to offer their cooperation to the British Government so that it could win the war. However, the believed that the great of Home Rule to India was in the interests of the British Empire in its war against Germany and Austria as she could then fight with greater moral force.

The year 1917 was an eventful year in the sense that the two Home Rule Leagues of Tilak and Annie Besant worked in co operation with each other. Tilak confined his activities to the Bombay presidency and the Central Provinces and the rest of India was left to Annie Besant. The branches of the Home Rule League were set up all over the country and there was a popular demand for Home Rule.

Tilak went on a whirlwind tour of the country in 1916 and appealed to the people to unite under the banner of the Home Rule League. His target was not the British Empire or the Emperor of India but the bureaucracy in India. In his public speeches, he declared emphatically that Home Rule was the only cure for India's political ills and grievances, that liberty was tile birthright of every man and that the aspiration to get one's liberty was the essence of human nature A small minority from outside India could not be allowed to rule the country arbitrarily.

Annie Besant also toured the country amid created a lot of enthusiasm among the people for the national cause. Her articles in the Commonweal and New India were very popular. C.Y. Chintamani says: "Annie Besant stirred the country by tile spoken

as well as the written word, as scarcely as ally one else could do." Annie Besant's work was particularly among the Women of India who showed "uncalculating heroism, endurance and tile selfless sacrifice of the feminine nature.

The British Government could not be expected to keep quiet in the face of a stir created by the Home Rule Leagues and their leaders and it decided to curb the activities of those leaders who were in the forefront of the movement. The existing statutes were tightened. There was already an ordinance to prevent tile entry of undesirable aliens into India. The Defence of India Act, 1915 superseded the ordinary criminal law of country and action under it could be taken against agitators. The provisions of the Indian Press Act 1910 were strictly enforced to stop the propaganda of the Home Rule Leaguers. Circulars were issued by which the students of schools and colleges were forbidden from taking part in the Home Rule Movement. In July 1916, Tilak was prosecuted for delivering seditious speeches and was ordered to furnish a personal bond of Rs. 20,000. Externment orders were served on him and he was ordered not to enter Delhi and the Punjab. Similar action was taken against Annie Besant. She was ordered to furnish security for her press and the Commonweal and New India. In all, she deposited Rs. 20,000 arid the whole that amount was forfeited by the Government. The Government also took action against Annie Besant and her two associates, B.P. Wadia and G,S. Arundale. The Governor of Madras called Annie Besant for an interview and told her that she was to be interned. There was a lot of indignation all over the country against her intern Protest meetings were held all over the country at repression by the police was condemned.

Non-cooperation Movement

In the critical closing year of the war, the repressive policy of the British Government was becoming worse and worse. The Press Act was severely enforced. There were restrictions on Tilak and Mrs. Besant. In Bengal the number of youngmen interned ran upto nearly three thousand. There was great hardship and discontent, specially in the Punjab on account of recruiting and

war fund activities of the Government. The war had come to a close already when the Congress met at Delhi.in19 18 under the Presidentship of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviva, The allies had been successful and the principle of self-determination had been declared b President Wilson, Llvod George and other statesmen. In the light of this situation, the Delhi Congress re-examined the position with regard to the Montague-Chelmsford scheme, demanding Dominion Status' and representation on Peace Conference, and nominating Lokmanya, Gandhiji and Hussan lmam as its representatives. The Congress also urged the withdrawal of all repressive laws.

But the demands of the Delhi Congress were not only unheeded but as 1919 showed-the Government having won the war, felt itself free now, to deal with the agitation and rebellion in India, in its own way. The Rowlatt Bills were introduced in February 1919 in the Supreme Legislative Council which provided for severe curtailment of civil liberties.

Gandhi Enters Active Politics

It was at this time that Gandhiji entered the field of Indian politics actively. He took the history decision to begin for the first time, a satygraha movement in the country to protest against the Rowlatt Act.

On the 18th March he published the pledge: "Being conscientiously of opinion that the Emil known as the Indian Criminal law Emergency Powers Bill, No 2 of 1919, are unjust, subversive of the principals of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of an individual on which the safety of India as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming law and until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civily to obey these law and such other laws as the Committee, hereafter to be appointed, may think fit, and we further affirm that in the struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property."

The 30th of March 1919 was fixed for a hartal, a day of fasting, penance and prayer, hut was changed to 6th April which can be called a red letter day in Indian history. The response of the

people startled the Government, which flushed with victory, lost its head. There was firing at place. At Delhi, Swami Sharadhananda when threatened with shooting by British soldiers, bared his chest for the bullets. There were glorious scenes of Hindu-Muslim fraternisation. Swami Shradhananda was allowed to preach from the pulpit of Jamma Masjid. The country took to this new idea, as if they had been waiting for it, all along. A new chapter in the national struggle had begun. The happenings in the Punjab soon provided the immediate source of a deep and torrential flood of national awakening.

Punjab Atrocities

The story of the Punjab is toowell-known and remembered to be repeated in any detail. The Punjab has been the citadel of British Imperialism, recruiting ground of the army of occupation; and reaction - and ruthlessness has distinguished the Punjab Government policy ever since the beginning uptil the last days of British departure. The legacy of that policy still overclouds our outlook and the situation in the Punjab is still the tragedy and menace of our country. In 1919, the Punjab was ruled by a more forthright imperialist in the person of Sir Michael O'Dwyer who was determined to save the Punjab from contamination of political agitation elsewhere. The Congress was to be held in Amritsar in 1919 and Sir Michael O'Dwyer sent for the local Congress leaders, Dr Kitchlew and Dr Satyapal to his house and they were spirited away to unknown places. This was on the 10th April 1919. Crowds of people gathered and wanted to meet the District Magistrate to ask the where about of these popular leaders. There was firing and brickbats and the casualties made the people very agitated and the mob killed five Englishmen and burnt a bank and some other buildings. There were similar incidents at Gujeranwalla and Kasur and minor outbreaks elsewhere. Martial law was declared in the Punjab and same day.

Jallianwalla Bagh Massacre

On 12 April 1919, a proclamation was issued--by General Dyer, who had taken charge of the troops the day before, that no

meetings or gatherings of the people were to be held. However, no steps were taken to see that the proclamation was brought to the notice of the people living in the various localities of the city. The result was that, it was announced on 12 April evening that there would be public meeting on 13 April 1919 at 4.30 p.m. in the Jallianwala Bagh. Neither General Dyer nor other authorities took any action to stop the meeting. The meeting started at the right time and there were about 6,000 to 10,000 people present in the meeting. All of them were practically unarmed and defenceless. The Jallianwala Bagh was closed practically on al sides by walls except one entrance. General Dyer entered the Jallianwala Bagh with armoured cars and troops. Without giving any warning to the people to disperse, he ordered the troops to fire and he continued to do so till the whole of the ammunition at his disposal was exhausted At least one thousand persons were killed. The contention of General Dyer was that he wanted to teach the people a lesson so that they might not laugh at him. He would have fired and fired longer, he said, if he had the required ammunition He h only fired 1,600 rounds because his ammunition had run out The regime of Dyer imposed some unthinkable punishments The water and electric supply of Amritsar were cut off Public flogging was common How ever, the "Crawling Order" was the worst of all

The news of events in the Punjab, suppressed at first soon sent a wave of horror and fury throughout the length and breadth of the country. This massacre proved to be a turning point in the history of the freedom movement.

For eight months the Government tried to draw a veil over the Punjab massacre. After the Congress had conducted and published an enquiry into the facts by a committee consisting of Gandhjji, Motilal Nehru, C. R. Das, Abbas Tyabji and Jaykar, and in face of widespread agitation the Government set up a committee under Lord Hunter. Inspite of the ugliest findings, this committee tried to whitewash and justify the perpetrators of the crimes, with mild regret. The House of Commons did not fail to glorify General Dyer and public subscriptions were raised in England to honour him.

Gandhiji's Decision

Mahatma Gandhi had so far believed in the justice and fairplay of the British Government. He had given his full cooperation to the Government during the First World War, inspite of opposition from men like Tilak. But the tragedy at Jallianwala Bagh, the imposition of Martial Law in the Pun jab findings of the Hunter Committee in 1920 on the tragic events of the Punjab, completely shattered the faith of Mahatma Gandhi in the good sense of the Britishers. He, therefore, decided to start Non cooperation Movement. He felt that the old methods must be given up.

A special session of the Congress met at Calcutta from 4th to 9th September, 1920. Here Gandhiji himself moved the resolution on non-cooperation. He was opposed not only by the President elect, Lala Lajpatrai and by other stalwarts like Chittaranjan Das, but ultimately he carried the day. Pandit Motilal Nehru joined Gandhiji at once and gave up his practice. The resolution was carried by a majority of 1855 votes as against 873.

The country had now found a way to express its intese desire for freedom and a new atmosphere soon began to pervade it. The non-cooperation programme was to be finally discussed and ratified at Nagpur. An unprecedented of delegates attended the Nagpur session. The Nagpur Congress really marked the new era in the Freedom movement The old feeling of impotent range and importunate request gave place to a new sense of responsibility and a self reliance Lalali and Deshbandhu came to oppose proposals but stayed to be converted. The Nagpur Congress made Gandhiji the indisputedly supreme authority in the Congress and outside. Seasoned leaders like B.C. Pal and Malaviyaji, Jinnah and Khaparde, and stalwarts like C.R. Das and Lalaji were all won over. The Nagpur Congress also changed the creed of the Congress, "in such a fashion as to eliminate the declared adherence of that body to the British connection and to constitutional methods of agitation."

The Programme

The programme of the Non-Cooperation Movement was clearly stated in the non-cooperation resolution. It involved the

surrender of titles and honorary offices and resignation from nominated posts in the local bodies. The non-cooperators were not to attend Darbars and other official and semi-official functions held by the Government officials or in their honour. They were to withdraw their children gradually from schools and colleges and establish national schools and colleges. They were to boycott gradually the British courts and establish private arbitration courts. They were not to join the army as recruits for service in Mesopotamia. They were not to stand for election to the Legislatures and they were also not to vote. They were to use Swadeshi cloth. Handi-spining and hand-weaving were to be encouraged. Untouchability was to be removed as there could be no Swaraj without this reform. Mahatma Gandhi promised Swaraj within one year if people followed his programme sincerely and whole-heartedly. Ahimsa or non-violence was to be strictly observed by the non-co-operators. They were not to give up Satya or truth under any circumstances.

The Non Cooperation Movement captured the imagination of the pet Both the Hindus and Muslims participated in it There was wholesale burning of foreign goods. Many student left schools and colleges and the Congress set up such national educational institutions the Kashi Vidyapeeth, Benares Vidyapeeth, Gujarat Vidyapeeth, Bihar Vidyapeeth, Bengal National University, National College of Lahore, Jamia Millia in Delhi and the National Muslim University of Aligarh. Seth Jamma Lal was declared that he would give Rs. one lakh a year for the maintenance of non-practising lawyers. Forty lakh volunteers were enrolled by the Congress. Twenty thousand Charkhas were manufactured, The people started deciding their disputes by means of arbitration.

The non-cooperation movement had both a positive and a negative aspect. The positive aspect included the revival of hand-spinning and weaving, removal of untouchability, promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity and prohibition. The negative aspect fell into three parts: boycott of legislatures, courts, and government educational institutions. This boycott movement spread like wild fire. The Government tried to crush the movement by large-scale arrests, but this only helped to strengthen the movement.

In July 1921 the All India Congress Committee decided to counter the government policy of repression by not participating in the welcome to the Prince of Wales who was to visit India in November- December 1921. When the Prince of Wales came to India, he was "greeted" with hartals throughout the country. The Government persisted in the policy of repression; the Congress and the Khilafat Volunteers' Organisation were declared illegal and large numbers of Congress workers were put behind prison bars.

Civil Disobedience

Mahatma Gandhi was convinced that the only way to make the Government see reason was to start the civil disobedience movement and he decided to start the, same in Bardoli in Gujarat. The Congress Working Committee called upon the people of India to cooperate with the people of Bardoli "by refraining from mass or individual civil disobedience of an aggressive character, except upon the express consent of Mahatma Gandhi previously obtained." Mahatma Gandhi wrote to the Viceroy and gave 7 days to accept his demands. The Viceroy held, the Congress responsible for all the lawlessness in the country. Mahatma Gandhi was left with no alternative but to launch the civil disobedience movement.

Unfortunately, at this time, the tragedy of Chauri Chaura occurred which changed the course of Indian history. What actually happened was that a mob of 3,000 persons killed 25 policemen and one inspector on 5 February, 1922. Similar tragic events had already occurred on 17 November, 1921 in Bombay and on 13 January 1922 in Madras. This was too much for Mahatma Gandhi who stood for complete non-violence. The result was that Mahatma Gandhi gave orders for the suspension of the Non-cooperation Movement at once. The Goverment was not satisfied with this action of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress. It was feared that Mahatma Gandhi was out for a bigger trouble and conseq-uently he was arrested on 13 March,1922. His trial began in Ahmedabad and he pleaded guilty. He took upon himself full responsibility for the occurrences in Madras, Bombay and Chauri Chaura and told Mr. Broomfield, the British judge, that he would "do the same again" if he was set free. He was sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment. The action of Mahatma Gandhi in suspending the movement was severely criticised from many quarters. According to Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, "Long letters were written from behind the bars by Pt.

Motilal Nehru and Lalà Lajpat Rai They took Gandhi to task for punishing the whole country for the sins of a place."

Dr. R.C. Majumdar says that the most outstanding feature of the Non-cooperation Movement was the willingness and ability of the people in general to endure hardships and punishments inflicted by the Government. It is true that the movement collapsed but the memory of its greatness survived and was destined to inspire the nation to launch a more arduous campaign. The movement served as a baptism of fire which initiated the people to a new faith and new hope and inspired them with a new confidence in their power to fight for freedom. As a result of this movement, the Congress movement for the first time became a really mass movement. The national awakening not only penetrated to the people at large but also made them active participants in the struggle for freedom. Moreover, the Indian National Congress was turned into a genuine revolutionary organisation. It was no longer a deliberative assembly but an organised fighting party pledged to revolution.

The Swarajist Party

When C. R. Das and the other Bengal leaders were in Alipore Cenral Jail, they evolved a new programme of non-cooperation with the Government through legislatures. Their idea was to enter the legislatures in large numbers and "carry on a policy of uniform, continuous and consistent opposition to the Government." Motilal Nehru also shared the views of C.R. Das. In July 1922, C.R. Das came out of jail and began to carry on propaganda in favour of Council-entry.

When a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee was held at Calcutta in November 1922, there were differences of opinion among the Congress leaders on the question of Council-

entry. While C,R. Das, Motilal Nehru and Hakim Ajmal Khan were in favour of it, C. Rajagopalachari, Dr. Ansari, etc., were opposed to it. In spite of lengthy debates, no decision was arrived at. At the annual session of the Congress held at Gaya in December 1922, the "No-changers" won a victory and the programme of Council-entry was rejected. C.R. Das who presided over the session resigned from the Congress and announced his decision to form the Swarajist Party. The Object of the new party was to wreck the Government of India Act, 1919 from within the Councils. In March 1923, the first Conference of the Swarajist Party was held at the residence of Motilal Nehru at Allahabad and the future programme of the Party was decided. The keynote of the programme of the Party was obstructionism. Its members were to contest elections on the issue of the redress of the wrongs done by the British bureaucracy, to oppose every measure of the Government and to throughout all legislative enactments proposed by the British Government. This view of the Swarajists was that the seats in the legislatures must be captured so that they did not fall into the hands of undesirable persons who were tools in the hands of the bureaucracy in India. The leaders of the Swarajist Party declared that outside the Councils, they would co operate with the constructive programme of the Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and in case their methods failed, they would, without any hesitation, join Mahatma Gandhi's civil disobedience movement if and when launched by him.

The Swarajist Party fought the elections in 1923 and refused to come to any understanding with the Liberal Federation. The Swarajist Party won a majority in the Legislative Council of the Central Provinces. It was the dominant Party in Bengal. It also won good support in U.P. and Bombay. However, the Swarajist party was at its best in the Central Assembly under the leadership of Motilal Nehru. By winning over the support of the Nationalist Party and a few other members, the Swarajist Party was able to command a working majority and was thus able to accomplish a lot. On 18 February, 1924, the Swarajist Party was able to get a resolution passed by which the Government was requested to establish full responsible Government in India. A demand was

also made that a Round Table Conference consisting of the representatives of India should be called at an early date to frame a Constitution for India. The appointment of the Muddiman Committee was the result of a resolution of the Swarajist Party. Motilal Nehru was requested to become a member of this Committee but he refused. Some of the demands in the budget of 1924-25 were rejected by the Central Assembly as a result of the efforts of the Swarajist Party. The Assembly also refused to allow the Government to introduce the entire Finance Bill. In February 1925, V.J.Patel introduced a Bill asking for the repeal of certain laws and with the exception of one, the Bill was passed. A resolution was passed with the help of the Swarajist Party demanding the release of certain political prisoners. The Swarajists resorted to walkouts as a mark of protest against the policy of the Government. They boycotted all receptions, parties or functions organised by the Government. What was done in the Central Assembly was also done in those provincial legislatures where the Swarajists had some influence.

According to R. C. Majumdar, the Swarajist Party rendered a signal service to the country. For the first time, the Legislative Assembly wore the appearance of a truly National Assembly where national grievances were fully voiced, national aims and aspirations expressed without any reservation and real character of the British rule exposed. The British autocracy and Indian bureaucracy stood exposed to the whole world.

Simon Commission and Nehru Report

The Government of India Act, 1919, had provided that a review of the constitutional position would be made after ten years. However, the British Government appointed Royal Commission headed by

SirJohn Simon in 1927, two years ahead of time, to go into the question of constitutional reforms. This Commission did not contain any Indian members; its all-white composition was treated by the people of India as an to national dignity. When Simon landed in Bomb he was treated with black flags and shouts of "Simon, go back", and there was a countrywide hartal. Anti-

Simon, demonstration took place all over the country anti Lala Lajpat Rai, the "Lion of Punjab", was struck with lathi blows of the police, and he died soon afterwards.

The Congress, on the other hand, appointed an all-parties Committee to draft a new Constitution for India. As a result, there emerged a report which, drafted under the chairmanship of Motilal Nehru, was called the Nehru Report. The Nehru Report marked a watershed in the constitutional thinking of Indian nationalists. The Nehru report came up before the Calcutta Congress for approval. At the Cakutta Session of the Cohgress held in 1928, it was intended to pass a resolution declaring complete independence as the goal of India. However, Mahatma Gandhi. intervened and Dominion Status was declared to be the goal of India. Mahauna Gandhi gave the assurance that he himself would lead the movement for independence if by the end of 1929 the British Government did not confer Dominion Status on India. The year 1929 had been a year of waiting.

Independence Pledge

When the Congress leaders met on the banks of the river Ravi, near Lahore, in 1929 they were disappointed over the attitude of the British Government. Leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhash Chandra Bose and Srinivas Iyengar asked for bold action against the Government. In his presidential address Jawaharlal Nehru condemned British imperialism, Kings and Princes and declared himself to be a socialist and a republican. He called upon the leaders assembled there to take strong action in these words: "Talking of high stakes and going through great dangers were the only way to achieve great things." He declared that complete independence should be the goal of the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi also approved of that goal but he did not like to precipitate matters. A resolution was passed that the word Swaraj in the Congress Constitution means "complete independence." All Congressmen taking part in the National Movement were asked not to take part, directly or indirectly, in future elections and the sitting members were asked to resign their seats. The All India Congress Committee was authorised to launch a programme of civil disobedience

including the non-payment of taxes. On midnight of 31 December 1929, as the new year was ushered in the Tricolor Flag of Puma Swaraj was hoisted on the banks of the river Ravi by the Congress President, Jawaharlal Nehru.

26 January 1930 was declared Independence Day and a pledge was taken by the people of India on that date and the same independence pledge was repeated year af year. The Independence pledge began with the words: "We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life so that they may have full opportunity for growth. We believe also that if any Government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have further right to alter it or abolish it. The British Government of India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has ruined India economically, politically, culturally and spiritually".

Satyagraha Era

PURNA SWARAJ celebrations throughout the county on 26thJanuarv, 1930, in the wake of the famous Lahore Session, revealed the pent-up feelings, enthusiasm and readiness of the people for sacrifice. The independence pledge had rekindled the smouldering fire and a new upsurge was in the offing.

It was iii this atmosphere that All India Congress Working Committee met in February at Sabarmati and authorised Gandhiji to start Civil Disobedience Movement at a time and 1 of his choice.

It was not yet clear what would be the programme of action. Gandhiji's strategy was not dear even to his closest associates. But the country had unbounded faith in Gaudhiji's leadership. Earlier he had made his 11-point demand on the Victory and had offered inspite of every thing that had happened, to call of T Civil Disobedience. These points included total prohibition, reduction of Rupee ratio to Is. 4d. reduction of Land Revenue by half, reduction of all Military expenditure by half, protective Tariff on foreign cloth, relaxation of the Arms Act for self-defence and abolition of Salt Tax.

It soon became known that Salt Tax was to he chosen for (tired action campaign. This, when it started, appeared fantastic and ridiculous to time Moderates amid the Government. But soon the country was ablaze with the mighty movement that is remembered with pride "In it one might have said, the progress of a thousand ears was encompassed within the events of a year."

Gandhiji was to start on Dandi March to take possession of the salt deposits of the Government-Salt Depot in the seashore. Before starting this march, Gandhiji, sent a letter to the Viceroy apprising him of his plan. This letter, sent through Mr. Reginald Reynolds, an Englishman Ashramite, gave a tale of India's ruination, poverty and serfdom under the British Raj, and demanded redress on the lines of the 11 points. If, however, no redress came, "On the 11th day of this month. shall proceed, with such co workers of the Ashram as I can take, to disregard the provisions of the Salt Laws. I regard this tax to be the mast iniquitous of all from the poor man's standpoint. As the Independence movement is essentially for the poorest in the land, the beginning will be made with this evil, The wonder is that we have submitted to the cruel monopoly for so long. It is, I know, open to you to frustrate my design by arresting me. I hope that there will be tens of thousands ready, in a disciplined manner, to take up the work after me, and, in the act of disobeying the Salt Act, to lay themselves open to the penalties of a Law that should never have disfigured the Statute Book."

The Victory's reply to this ultimatum came back quickly, and was unequivocal. His Excellency expressed his regret that Mr. Gandhi should have been "Contemplating a course of action which was clearly bound to involve violation of the law and danger to the public peace."

Gandhiji wrote, "On bended knees I asked for bread and received the stone instead English Nation responds only to force, and I am not surprised by the Viceregal reply. The only public peace the Nation knows is the peace of the public prison. India is a vast prison-house. I repudiate this (British) Law and regard it as my sacred duty to break the mournful monotony of

compulsory peace that is choking the heart of the Nation for want of free vent."

Historic March to Dandhi

Gandhiji began his march at 6.30 a.m. on 12th March, 1930 accompanied by his 79 Ashramites. It was a historic scene, calling back to our minds, the old legends coupled with the names of Shri Rama and the Pandavas. Motilal Nehru compared it to the march of Shri Rama Chandrato Sri Lanka. C.F. Andrews regarded it as Moses leading the exodus of Israelities. Americans compared the epic march to Lincoln's decision to maintain the Union and his sending troops to the southern States. And all this by one frail unarmed man at 61, challenging the then strongest empire.

The March was widely reported and anxiously watched all over the country. Each day added to the fervour and enthusiasm. 300 Village officers tendered their resignations from the area through which Gandhiji passed. Gandhiji had said earlier "Wait till I begin. Once I march to the place, you will know what to do." He had a clear vision of this scheme of resistance when others were in the dark.

Government had not yet arrested Gandhiji but Sardar Vallabhbhai and some other leaders had already been put in jail.

The road was watered, the path was strewn with flowers and leaves and decorated with flags and festoons. Crowds gathered everywhere to witness the march and pay homage to this strange army and its general. Gandhiji preached his old Gospel along the route. Khaddar, abstinence from drink and removal of untouchability were the three favourite themes, but he also enjoyed that all should join the Satyagrahis. During the march he declared that he would either die on the way or else keep away from the Ashram until Swaraj was won. Gandhiji' s march lasted 24 days. They had traversed a distance of 200 miles. All along he was emphasising that the march was a pilgrimage, a period of penance not to be spent in feteing and feasting.

On the morning of April 5th, Gandhiji reached Dandi. Soon after the morning prayers, Gandhiji and his volunteers proceeded

to break the Salt Law by picking up the salt lying on the seashore. Immediately after this Gandhiji issued a press statement: "Now that the technical or ceremonial breach of the Salt Law has been committed, it is now open to anyone who would take the risk of prosecution under the Salt Law to manufacture salt wherever .he wishes, and wherever it is convenient."

Arrest of Gandhiji

The country had been held back and was now ablaze from end to end, being permitted to start salt satyagraha as from the 6th of April, the national week. Huge public meetings were held in all big cities, the audience running up to six figures. The events at Karachi, Shiroda, Ratnagiri, Patna, Peshawar, Calcutta, Madras and Sholapur constituted a new experience in self-sacrifice and also laid bare the mailed fist of the British Government. There were military firings, lathi charges and arrests. Special Ordinances were promulgated to suppress the movement The press was stricken hard Gandhiji had been guiding the movement through his speeches and his Navjivan all along The Government had expected the movement to fizzle out if Gandhiji was left alone Gandhiji then drafted his second letter to the Viceroy announcing his intention of raiding the salt works of Dharsana and Chharsada Then came the time for the arrest of Gandhiji It was ten past one in the night when he was placed in a police car and taken to Yerwada prison.

Mr Ashmead Bartlett of the London Telegraph wrote: "There was something intensely dramatic in the atmosphere while we were waiting for the train, for we all felt we were sole eye-witnesses of a scene which may become historical, this arrest of a prophet, false or true for, false or true, Gandhi is now regarded as a holy man and a saint by millions of Indians Who knows whether one hundred years from now he may be worshipped as a supreme being by 300 million people We could not shake off these thoughts and it seemed incongruous to be at a level-crossing at dawn to take the prophet into custody."

Before the arrest, however, Gandhiji had dictated at Dandi his last message advising on what was to be done. In this he had said,

"After I am arrested, neither the people nor my colleagues should be daunted The conductor of this fight is God and not I" "Whole villages should come forward to pick or manufacture salt Women should picket liquor and opium shops and foreign cloth shops In every house young and old should begin spinning on takli and heaps of yarn should be daily woven. There should be bonfires of foreign cloth. Hindus should regard none as untouchables. Hindus, Muslims, Parsees and Christians, all should heartily embrace one another. The major communities should be satisfied with what remains after satisfaction of minor communities. Students should leave Government schools, and Government servants should resign and be employed in the service of the people, like the brave Patels and Talatis who have resigned. Thus shall we easily complete Swaraj."

After the Arrest

Gandhiji's arrest was followed by demonstrations from one end of the country to the other. It was the signal for voluntary and complete Hartals in Bombay, Calcutta and several other places. The whole city of Bombay was astir with the huge procession and several public meetings About 50,000 men had struck work in the mills. Railway Workshops had to be closed. Cloth merchants decided on a 6-day hartal. Resignations from Honorary officers and services were announced at frequent intervals. There were serious disturbances at Sholapur and in Calcutta.

Gandhiji's arrest had raised a worldwide protest There were sympathetic hartals among Indian businessmen in places as far wide as Panama, Sumatra and the boycott movement was a matter of concern to the press in England, Germany and France In America an influentially signed message was cabled to Mr Ramsay Mecdonald by prominent clergymen led by Dr John Hayne Holmes

Civil Disobedience Extended

Mr Abbas Tayabji took up Gandhiji's place as Leader of the salt satyagra his but was soon arrested Arrests, lathi charges and repression was let loose in towns and villages but was met with an increasing tempo of resistance by the people After Gandhiji's

arrest, the Working Committee met in May at Allahabad and extended the scope of Civil Disobedience. It called upon the entire nation to make all sacrifices that they were capable of. Boycott of foreign cloth throughout the country was to be completed without delay and production of Khadi was to be intensified. Contraband salt manufacture was to be extended. Forest Laws were to be disobeyed.

Foreign cloth was to be boycotted. British goods including British banking, insurance, shipping and similar other institutions were to be boycotted. Lastly, "The Committee is of opinion that the time has arrived for the in of No-tax campaign by non-payment of special taxes in certain Provinces, and that a beginning should be made by non payment of the land tax in the Provinces were the ryotwari system prevails, such as Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnatak, Andhra, Tamil Nad and the Punjab, and the non-payment of the Chowkidari tax in Provinces like Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. It calls upon such Provinces to organize campaigns of non-payment of the land tax or Chowkidari tax in areas selected by, the Provincial Congress Committees."

Dharsana Raid

After the arrest of Mr. Tayabji, Shrimati Sarojini Naidu was to direct the raid at Dharsana. She was also arrested with her batch of volunteers. Batches of volunteers-later rushed towards the salt depot. They were beaten and chased out. The same evening another batch of 220 volunteers were arrested. Fresh batches of volunteers congregated arid more salt raids took place. A mass raid at Dharsana took place on the 21st May when 2,500 volunteers participated.

They w. led by Imam Saheb the 62 year old colleague of Gandhiji in South Africa, The volunteers commenced the raid early in the morning and as they attacked the salt heaps at different places, the Police would charge them with lath and beat them back. The Imam Saheb and other leaders were arrested. Hundreds of volunteers were injured, some of them fatally. As they were removed to Hospitals or prison camps by the Police, fresh batches came to Dharsana-to take their places.

Wadala Raids

A succession of raids were also made on the Wadala salt depot and hundreds of volunteers took part in them. But-the most demonstrative raid took place on the 1st June. On the morning of the first, nearly 15,000 volunteers and others participated in a mass raid at Wadala. Successive batches marched up to the-port Trust level-crossing and were held up by a police Cordon. Soon the raiders among whom were women children broke through the Cordon, splashed through slime and mud and ran over the pans The-raiders were repulsed by the Police who were acting under immediate supervision of the Home Member. Such mass raids took place in other parts of the country also. The way these raids were dealt with by the Police raised public indignation to high pitch. Mr. Webb Miller writing to the 'New Freeman-expressed abhorrence of the sights at Dharsana:-

> *"In eighteen years of reporting in twenty-two countries, during which I have witnessed innumerable civil disturbances, riots, street fights and rebellions, I have never witnessed such harrowing scenes as at Dharsana. Sometimes the scenes were so painful that I had to turn away momentarily. One surprising feature was the discipline of the volunteers. It seemed they were thoroughly imbued with Gandhi's don-violence creed."*

Civil Disobedience Spreads

The Civil Disobedience movement assumed various aspects and was carried with varying success in different Provinces. The boycott of foreign cloth had become more effective. The business community in Bombay including the mill owners rendered enthusiastic support. Bombay was the chief centre and guide for the rest of the country.

The movement was of revolt and defiance of the British authority on the one hand and constructive work for the masses on the other. Boycott of cloth was coupled with khadi. Prohibition took the shape of cutting down all Toddi trees and picketing all wine shops. Suppression of the newspapers was met with by innumerable cyclostyled news-sheets. There were processions and meetings in defiance of the Police.

The repression that was let loose to subdue this new spirit and situation was also diverse in shape and mounting to new heights in severity. The Working Committee of the Congress was declared unlawful and Pandit Motilal Nehru arrested.

The repression, however, served to intensify the movement specially its boycott aspects. The volunteer organizations in Bombay became more thoroughgoing. Women came to be front. Braving the sun and rain, and lath is and arrests these tender girls and women, made picketing very effective at the liquorshops and cloth shops. When a shopkeeper would not stop to sell his goods, his wife or daughter would go and picket his shop. The young and old women brought up in the seclusion of their homes had rallied to the call and found a new world in the sacrifice and suffering for the country. Their participation was electrifying in its effect, and incidentally brought them a new social emancipation in the process.

Incidents of heroism and names of places and persons that specially distinguished themselves in those glorious days are too numerous to be commemorated. We can but make mention of a few.

At Peshawar the Pathans once notoriously blood-thirsty and valiant, had been transformed into a non -violent people under the leadership of Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan affectionately called the Frontier Gandhi. They gave an account of themselves which has become a legend for the whole country. There were serious cases of firings at Peshawar, but the spirit of people remained totally unsubdued. At one time as the leader of the procession was shot down by the military police, another came to take his place and was shot down to be replaced by a third till there were several casualties in cold blood.

Another incident co with Peshawar fills one with pride. There was a wholesale firing on the unarmed crowds. Two Platoons of the second battalion of the 18th Garhwali Rifles, Hindu troops, in the midst of a Muslim crowd, refused the order to fire and fraternised with the people. A court- martial imposed savage sentences on 17 men of Garhwali rifles. One was given life

transportation, another 15 years rigorous imprisonment and rest terms varying from 3 to 10 years. This incident infused a new spirit among the people. From April 25th to May 4th Peshawar was in the hands of the people and had to be recaptured by powerful British forces with Air Squadrons.

In Bengal for some months, the district of Midnapore appeared to be beyond the reach of the Bengal Government. The revolutionary party, disagreeing with Gandhiji's non-violence were also active. The armoury raid in Chittagong, which even Gandhiji had to admit was a "daring deed", electrified the country. There were news, carried by the illicit hews-sheets and emissaries, of a strange new life and existence, in villages and towns. Young and old, men and women cheerfully braved the Police lathis, squatted on the road in passive resistance for hours on end when processions were blocked, and the satyagrahis were accompanied and seen off to jails with flowers and celebrations, by families and Friends. At Bombay a boy named Babu Ganno stood across a Police lorry at the Kalbadevi Road to prevent its progress and was crushed under it.

Bardoli Once More

In Gujarat, the great event was no-tax campaign successfully carried out in Bardoli and Borsad Talukas. The oppression by the authorities and the resistance of the peasantry was so great that 80,000 people left their homes and migrated to villages in the neighbourhood of Baroda State. Mr. Brails ford has given a description of the exodus, part of which is given below: "And then began one of the strangest migrations in history. One after another, acting with a unanimity of which only Indians with their tight caste organisations are capable, these villagers packed their belongings into their bullock carts and drove them across the border into Baroda.

A few even burned the rich crop which they were too late to remove. I visited one of their camps. They have built. Temporary shelters with matting for walls and palm leaves on sacking for a roof. The rains are over; they will suffer no grave hardship till May. But they are crowded together with their beloved cattle, and

packed in the narrow space are all their notice hold goods, the great jars in which they store their rice, cloth and chums, chests and beds, shining pots of brass, here a plough, there a picture of the gods, and everywhere, at intervals, the presiding genius of this camp a photograph of Mahatma Gandhi. I asked a big group of them why they had left their homes.

They women gave the promptest and simplest answer, "Because Mahatmaji is in prison." The men were still conscious of an economic grievance; "farming does not pay, and tax is unjust." One or two said, "To win Swaraj" or Self-Government. "I spent two memorable days touring the deserted villages is company with the Chairman of the Congress organization of Surat. One passed row after row of the padlocked cottages, and through the bars of the windows one could see only empty rooms. The streets were silent lakes of sunlight. Nothing moved until a monkey swung himself over a roof."

The heroic incident of the women of Borsadh may also be mentioned here. On the 21st January 1931 a demonstration was to be staged at Borsad. The Police determined to counter this demonstration, tried to over-awe the volunteers. The women of Borsad showed fearless resistance. Their pots were broken. They were dispersed by force, thrown down and the Police trod upon their chests with boots.

The Police spared, and respected nobody. S. Vallbhabhai's own mother aged over 80 was cooking her food and the boiling pot was knocked down by the Police. United Province was the only province where a general no-tax campaign was inaugurated. Both the Zamindars and tenants being called upon to withhold payment of rent and revenue.

In Bihar, the Chowkidar tax was withheld in large areas, The Province suffered to the full from the imposition of punitive police and confiscation of large properties in lieu of petty sums. In the Central Provinces various satyagrahis were successfully launched and continued inspite of the heavy finese and police excesses. Karnatak also organised no-tax campaign in which more than 800 families participated.

The Punjab gave a good account of itself, specially in the boycott of foreign cloth. Women picketers including Muslim ladies took part. Siapa-mock funeral wailing was practised on the houses of those who would sell foreign cloth. On 31st December, 1931, the anniversary of the independence resolution was celebrated. At Lahore Subhas Chandra Bose who had been released from jail after serving a year's term, was severely beaten while marching in a procession.

This harrowing tale and the epic of this glorious time in the national struggle constitutes the most memorable days of our freedom struggle.

As to the fall-out of the civil disobedience movement of 1930, Louis.Fischer writes. "Gandhi did two things in 1930. He made the British aware that .they were cruelly subjugaating India and he gave Indians the conviction that they would, by lifting their heads and straightening their spines, lift the yoke from their shoulders. The British beat the Indians with batons and rifle buts. The Indians neither avenged nor complained nor retreated.. That made England powerless and India invincible."

Gandhi-irwin Pact and First Round Table Conference

While the Civil Disobedience Movement continued vigorously in spite of untold repression, efforts were made for a compromise and after several attempts of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. M.R. Jayakar, an agreement was reached after 15 clays' strenuous discussions between the Viceroy and Mahatma Gandhi. This agreement, better known as the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, was signed on 5 March, 1931. Under the agreement, the Government was to make concession take stops for the participation of the representatives of Congress in the Second Round Table Conference, and the Congress on part, its had to withdraw the Civil disobedience Movement.

Meanwhile, a Round Table Conference had met in London early 1931. The intention seemed to have been, to set off the stage, before the world of "repres entative gathering" of Indians trying for an agreed plan for the future government of their country. It

was not Indians, but the Viceroy and his officials who chose these representatives. What they actually did was' to carefully assemble all the diverse elements, every creed, every party, every racial minority, every interest in this subcontinent. They collected-princes, princesses, untouchables, Christians, Sikhs, Muslims, Hindus, landlords, commercial magnates, official representatives of Labour, but the true representatives of he country, the Leaders of the Congress, were not there. They were enjoying hospitality in jails.

The spirit in which the Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed did not last long. In spite of protests from all quarters, the Government carried out the execution of Sardar Bagat Singh, Sukh Dev and Raj Dev and Raj Guru on 23' March '1931. On 18 April 1931, Lord Irwin was succeeded by Lord Willington. The new Viceroy had no intention to abide by the terms of the Pact.

Second Round-table Conference

In the meantime, however, the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution that Mahatma Gandhi should represent the Congress at the Second Round Table Conference to be convened later in193 1 in London. Mahatma Gandhi did attend the Conference as the sole representative of the Congress. As was expected, the communal question and the differences among the Indian people loomed large in this conference and all efforts to solve it by consent proved unsuccessful. Gandhiji put up a valiant light and some of the speeches he delivered were most striking. Speaking on the Congress that he represented, he said: "I am but a poor humble agent acting on behalf of the Indian National Congress, which is, if lam not mistaken, the oldest political organisation we have in India It has had nearly 50 years of life during which period it has, without any interruption, held its annual session. It is what it means-National. It represents no particular community, no particular class, no particular interest It claim to represent all Indian interests and 411 classes It is a matter of the greatest pleasure to me to state that it was first convinced in an English brain, Allan Octavian Hume. It was nursed by two great Parsees, Pherozeshah Mahta and Dadabhai Naoroji, whom all India delighted to recognise as its Grand Old

Man. From the very commencement, the Congress had Mussalmans, Christians, Anglo-Indians, I might say all religious, sects, creeds, represented upon it more or less fully. The late Budruddin Tyabji identified himself with, the Congress. We have had Musalmans as Presidents of the Congress, and P too. We have had women as our Presidents; Dr. Annie Besant was the first, and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu followed.

"The Congress ha from its very commencement taken up the cause of the so-called 'untouchables'. Just as the' Congress considered Hindu-Muslim unity, thereby meaning unity amongst all the classes, to be indispensable for the attainment of S so also did the Congress' consider the removal of the curse of untouchability as an indispensable condition for the attainment of full freedom.

> *"Above all the Congress represents, in its essence, the dumb semi-starved millions scattered over the length and breadth of the land in its 7,00,000 villages, no n whether they come from what is called British India, or what is called Indian India.*
>
> *"One word more as to the so-called untouchables," said he, "I can understand the claims advanced on behalf of other communities, but the claims advanced on. behalf of the 'untouchables' are to me the unkindest cut of all. It means a perpetual bar sinister. We do not want the 'untouchables' to be classified as a separate class. Sikhs mayremain such in perpetuity, so may Muslims and Christians. Will the untouchables remain untouchables in perpetuity? I would far rather that Hinduism died than that untouchability lived. Those who speak of the political rights of untouchables do not know India and do not know how Indian society is constructed. Therefore, I want to say with all the emphasis I can command that if I was the only person to resist this thing, I will resist it with my life."*

Apparently the Government's scheme at the Round Table Conference was only a scheme for Indians sharing power with the beaurocracy and not one designed to achieve responsible Government. "I wish them well and the Congress is entirely out

of it. The Congress will wander," said Gandhiji, "no matter how many years, in the wilderness, rather than bend itself to a proposal under which the hardy tree of freedom and Responsible Government can never grow." An impasse had developed over the communal question.

When the conference concluded on the first of December, Gandhiji proposed the vote of thanks to the chair and pointed out that they had come to the parting of ways and that their ways would take different directions. He said, "the dignity of human nature is such that we must face the storms of life. I do not know in what direction my path would lie. But it does not matter to me. Even though I may have to go in an exactly different direction, you are still entitled to a vote of thanks from the bottom of my heart."

Gandhiji returned empty-handed from the Round Table Conference. The condition on which the Congress had agreed to participate, abandonment of stark repression, was also being broken. Jawaharlal Nehru and T.A.K. Sherwa ni had been arrested and put in jail again. In the North West Frontier Province Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and Dr. Khan Saheb were also arrested. Special Ordinances had been enforced in the United Provinces, the North West Frontier Province and in Bengal.

Congress Declared Unlawful

Gandhiji had strictly warned the Congressmen not to initiate any aggressive campaign but not to suffer any insults to national self-respect. The truce period had been the period of preparation on the part of the Government for renewed hostilities. The Working Committee severely condemned the atrocities and the terrible losses and indignities inflicted on innocent people in pursuance of the policy of terrorism. The President of the Congress that year, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, had addressed the Government on several occasions with no result. Gandhiji asked the Viceroy for an interview but was refused. The beaurocracy now wanted to teach the Congress a lesson. Gandhiji was arrested on January 4, 1932, and the principal Congress leaders all over the country were simultaneously put in jail. Congress was declared illegal. Their

funds, premises and property confiscated, their press was banned. Ready made ordinances were broght forth and enforced.

The Congress and the country took up this ruthless challenge. By March 2nd, 1932 already there were 80,000 arrests. By April they rose to 1,20,000. Repression, this time, also exceeded by far the level of 1931. There were wholesale shootings and violence. Enormous fines on persons and villages and seizure of lands and property along with arrests, were made. The Government had contemplated that the movement would be over in six weeks time but it was not before 29 months that the fight had to be given up.

During this period, in spite of precautions taken by the Government and in face of ruthless prosecutions, the annual session of the Congress was held in brief electrifying hours at Delhi and in Calcutta.

Gandhiji's Epic Fast

In September 1932 Gandhiji declared a fast unto death, to undo the provisions of the Communal Award of Ramsay McDonald, the then British Prime Minister, providing for the scheme of separate representation for the depressed classes, since that would yivisect Hinduism.

In May, 1933 Gandhiji undertook another last not against the Government but "for purification of myself and my associates and for greater vigilance and watchfulness in connection with the Harijan cause." The president of the Congress in consultation with Gandhiji announced the suspension of the Civil Disobedience movement for 6 weeks. In July l9 asked for interview with the Viceroy which was refused.. The Government, however, continued its course of repression Gandhiji who was later released decided to devote his Lime to Harijan work.

The struggle was finally suspended by the All India Congress Committee who were allowed to meet at Patna and decided to call off the Civil Disobedience unconditionally, except for the provision that Gandhiji alone, when he thought. it necessary, could offer Civil Disobedience. Gandhiji decided to start an individual Civil Disobedience movement, as from 1 August 1933,

but he was arrested the previous night. He was released after a couple of days but was ordered to reside at Poona. Gandhi disobeyed this order, was re-arrested and sentenced to. one year's imprisonment. Thereupon hundreds of Congressmen followed Gandhiji to prison. This movement continued till the early part of April; 1934.

Throughout this period the government continued to pursue a policy of severe repression which included imprisonment, police firing, beating in lock-up, shooting of detenus, atrocity on women, blockading of villages, and even looting and pillage.

During the Civil Disobedience movement of 1930-31, more than 60,000 persons were imprisoned and during the Second Civil obedience movement of 1932-34 the .number of persons who courted arrest were, about 66,000. The programme or the boycott of British goods which was part of the movements led to a substantial fall in the import of British goods into India. Further, the Civil Disobedience movements roused the India people in general, including villagers and women folk. Women rarely came out of the seclusion of their homes in order to the part in take struggle for freedom. This not only gave an inpetus to the freedom movement, but also helped in bringing out another social revolution: the emancipation of women.

When the Civil Disobedience movement came to an end in April, 1934, Gandhiji appealed to Congressmen to devote themselves a nation-building activities: promotion of Hindu-Muslim unity, removal of untouchability, and spread of hand-spinning.

The Second World War and the Congress

The Second World War began on 1st September, The Second World War 1939. Two days later, the Viceroy of India declared war against Germany without consulting or taking into confidence the Indian leaders. Indian troops were sent to the various theatres of war for the defence of the British Empire. Congress Reaction After having done all this, the Victory started consultations with the Indian leaders. The Working Committee of the Congress met

at Wardha in September, 1939 and after prolonged deliberations, a resolution was adopted in which it was declared that if the war was "to defend the status quo, imperialist possessions, colonies, vested interests and privileges, then India could have nothing to do with it. If, however, the issue was democracy and a world based on democracy then India is intensely interested in the maintenance and extension of it. If Great Britain was fighting for democracy, then she must necessarily end imperialism in her own possessions and establish full democracy in India." The British Government was called upon to declare its war aims "in regard to democracy and 'imperialism" and also to declare whether those aims were "going to apply to India and to be given effect to at present."

Almost a year later, another resolution was passed by the Congress at Ramgarh in which an offer of co-operation in the war was made provided India's demand for independence was conceded and a provisional National Government responsible to the then Central Assembly was formed at the Centre. On 8th August, 1940, the Viceroy issued a statement in which it was declared that the new Constitution of India would primarily be the responsibility of the Indians themselves. However, it was made contemplate transfer of their clear that Great Britain "could not present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of Government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life, nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission of such a Government." It was also declared that after the war a "representative Indian constitution-making body would be set up and the Indian proposals as to its form and operation would at any time be welcome." The Congress was wholly disappointed with this offer.

Individual Satyagraha

In September, 1940, the AICC resolved, that the self imposed restraint of the Congress could not be carried to the extent of self-extinction. It was decided to launch Satyagraha in support of the modest demand and the issue of freedom of speech. On October

17, individual satyagraha commenced and Vinobha Bhave was the first nominee. Pandit Nehru was to follow him but was arrested on October31, 1940, and was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment.

This campaign was of a most restricted character so that the British Government might not be embarrassed in their hour of trial. The campaign thus, went on smoothly for 14 months. There was no attempt directly to interfere with the Government's war effort. Many of the leaders were later released. The war was drawing near India's border.

The Cripps Mission

The spectacular success of Japan and the pressure of the allies of Britain, during the early months of 1942 forced the British Government to make a serious attempt to end the deadlock in India. On March 11, 1942, Mr. Churchill announced that Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the War Cabinet, would go to India to explain certain constitutional proposals. Sir Staffoid Cripps arrived at Delhi on March 22, 1942, and left Karachi for London on April 13. 1942.

The declaration of the British Government contained the following provisions (1) An elected constitution-making body would be set up in Indian after the war; (2) Provision would we made for the participation of the Indian States in the above constitution-making body: (3) The British Government would accept and implement the constitution-making body; but any Province of British India should have the right to reject the new constitution: (4) Revision of treaties with Indian States would be necessary: and (5) Until the new constitution could be framed, the British Government would remain, responsible for the defence of India. It will be seen that the provision about the non-accession of Provinces to the Indian Union and the arrangement about defence was quite unacceptable to the Congress. On April 2, 1942, the Working Committee adopted a resolution explaining the causes of its rejection of the Cripps Scheme. It was observed: "To take away defence from the sphere of responsibility at this stage is to reduce that responsibility to a farce and a nullity, and to make it perfectly clear that India is not going to be free in any way and

her Government is not going to function as a free and independent Government during the pendency of the war." In his 'Discovery of India' Pandit Nehru made it clear that Lord Linlithgow and the Civil Services sabotaged the Cripps Plan. The rejection of the plan by the Congress was followed by its rejection by the League, of course, for other reasons. Mahatma Gandhi remarked that the Cripps, "offer was a post-dated cheque on a crashing bank." He is stated to have told him thus: "Why did you come if this is what you have to offer? If this is your entire proposal to India, I would advise you to take the next plane home." Sir, Stafford's reply was "I will consider that."

Quit India Movement

The failure of the Cripps-Congress talks which had initially raised public expectations and excitement to a high pitch, caused a lot of disappointment.

Soon after the departure of Cripps, Gandhiji decided that the time for sterner policy and programme had come. The Japanese were knocking at India's gates. The suffering of the people as a result of prolonged war and a prevailing misgovernment was becoming unbearable. The attitude of the British Government did not show any change of heart. Gandhiji once again took up a revolutionary stand and started a campaign in his weekly paper, Harijans, holding forth Quit India idea. Gandhiji felt convinced that the British presence was the incentive for the Japanese attack. He said: "I am convinced that the time has come for the British and the Indians to be reconciled to complete separation from each other. Complete and immediate orderly withdrawal of the British from India at least in reality will at once put the Allied cause on a completely moral basis. The first condition of British success is the undoing of the wrong. I ask every Briton to support me in my appeal to the British at this hour to retire from every Asiatic and African possession. And when one puts morals, in the scales, there is nothing but gain to Britain, India and the world. I ask for a bloodless end of an unnatural domination and for a new era. Leave India to God and if that be too much, leave her to anarchy, necessity for withdrawal lies in its being immediate."

Genesis

The Working Committee, however, passed a resolution on July the 14th at Wardha, based on "Quit India" demand. The Congress gave 24 days to the Government to make a favourable response. On 15 July, 1942 Mahatma Gandhi told the foreign press that if the movement had to be launched it would be a non-violent one. On 25 July, 1942, President Chiang Kai-shek wrote to President Roosevelt to intervene so that the Congress was not forced to launch the movement. The letter was forwarded to Churchill but nothing came out of it.

A meeting of the All India Congress Committee was held in Bombay on 7 August, 1942 as scheduled, and on August 8, the now famous "Quit India" resolution was passed. The A.I.C.C. meeting at Bombay was one of the most remarkable gatherings and was more like a Congress session judged by the number of people that it attracted. The atmosphere was most tense and the speeches that were delivered on the resolution showed the intensity .of feeling that had been raised. Pandit Jawharlai Nehru moved this resolution, and Sardar Patel seconded it. The text of this fateful resolution that w destined to let loose a cataclysm of mass uprising beyond precedent and expectation in the following months, throughout the country; is given below.

Quit India Resolution (August 7-8,1942, Bombay, A.I.C.C.)

"The All India Congress Committee has given the most careful consideration to the reference made to it by the Working Committee iii their resolution dated July 14, 1942, and to subsequent events, inducing the development of the war situation, the utterances of responsible spokesman of the British government, and the comments and criticisms made in India and abroad. The Committee approves of and endorses that resolution and is of the opinion that events subsequent to it have given it further justification, and have made it clear that the immediate ending of British rule in India is an urgent necessity, both for the sake of India and for the success of the cause of the United Nations. The continuation of that rule is degrading and enfeebling India and making her progressively less capable of defending herself and of contributing

to the cause of world freedom. The committee has viewed with dismay the deterioration of the situation on the Russian and Chinese hunts and conveys to the Russian and Chinese people its high appreciation oh their heroism in defence of their freedom. This increasing peril makes it incumbent on all those who strive for freedom and who sympathise with the victims of aggression, to examine the foundations of the policy so fair pursued by the Allied Nations, which have led to repeated and disastrous failure, It is not by adhering to such aims and policies and methods that failure can be converted into success, for past experience has shown that failure is inherent in them.

These policies have been based not on freedom so much as on the domination of should and colonial countries, and the continuation of the imperialist tradition and method. The possession of empire, instead of adding to the strength of the ruling Power, has become a burden and a curse. India, the classic land of modern imperialism has become the crux of the question, for by the freedom of India will Britain and the United Nations be judged, and the people of Asia Africa be filed with hope and enthusiasm.

The ending of British rule in this country is thus a vital and immediate issue on which depend the future of the war and the success of freedom and democracy. A free India will assure this success by throwing all her great resources in the struggle for freedom and against the aggression of Nazism, Fascism and imperialism. This will not only affect materially the fortune of the war, but will bring all subject and oppressed humanity on the side of the United Nations, and give these Nations, whose ally Indians would be, the moral and spiritual leadership and the tent of that imperialism will affect the fortune of all the United Nations.

"The peril of today, therefore, necessitates the independence of India and the ending of British domination. No future promises or guarantees can affect the present situation or meet that peril. They cannot produce tile needed psychological effect on the mind of the masses. Only the glow of freedom now can release that energy and enthusiasm of millions of people which immediately transform the nature of the war."

"The A.I.C.C. therefore repeats s all emphasis the demand for the withdrawal of the British Power from India. On the declaration of India's Independence, a Provisional Government will he formed and Free India will become an ally of the United Nations, sharing with them in the trials and tribulations of the joint enterprise of the struggle for freedom. The Provisional Government can only be formed by the co-operation of the principal parties and groups in the country. It will thus be a composite government, representative of all important sections of the people of India. Its primary functions must be to defend India and resist aggression with all the armed as well as the non-violent forces at its command, together with its Allied powers, to promote the well-being and progress of the workers in the fields and factories and elsewhere, to whom essentially all power and authority must belong. The Provisional Government will evolve a scheme for a Constituent Assembly which will prepare a constitution for the Government of India acceptable to all sections of the people. This constitution according to the Congress view, should be a federal one, with the largest measure of autonomy for the federating units, and with the residuary powers vesting in these units. The future relations between India and the Allied Nations will be adjusted by representatives of all these free countries conferring together for their mutual advantage and for their co-operation in the common task of resisting aggression. Freedom will enable India to resist aggression effectively with the people's united will and strength behind it.

"The freedom of India must be the symbol of and prelude to the freedom of all other Asiatic nations under foreign dominations. Burma, Malaya, Indo-China, the Dutch Indies, Iran and Iraq must also attain theircompletefreedom. It must be clearly understood that such of these countries as are under Japanese control now must not subsequently be placed under the rule or control of any other Colonial Power.

"While the A.I. C.C. must primarily be concerned with the independence and defence of India in this hour of danger, the Committee is of opinion that the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a World Federation of free nations,

and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved, Such a World Federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of the world's resources from the comman good of all. On the establishment of such a World Federation, disarmament would be practicable in all countries, national armies, navis and air forces would no longer been necessary, and a World Federation Defence Force would keep the world peach and prevent aggression.

"An independent India would gladly join such a World Federation and co-operate on an equal basis with other nations in the solution of international problems.

"Such a Federation should be open to all nations who agree with its fundamental principles. In view of the war, however, the Federation must inevitably, to begin with, be confined to the United Nations. Such a step taken now will have a most powerful effect on the war, on the peoples of the Axis countries, and on the peace to come.

"The Committee regretfully realises, however, that despite the tragic and overwhelming lessons of war and the perils that overhang the world, the governments of few countries are yet prepared to take this inevitable step towards World Federation. The reactions of the British Government and the misguided criticism of the foreign press also make it clear that even the obvious demand for India's independence is resisted, though this has been made essentially to meet the present peril and to enable India to defend herself and help China and Russia in their hour of need. The Committee is anxious not o embarrass in any way the defence of China or Russia, whose freedom is precious and must be preserved, or to jeopardise the defensive capacity of the United Nations But the peril grows both to India and these nations, and in action and submission to a foreign administration at this stage is not only degrading India and reducing her capacity to defend herself and resist aggression, but is no answer to that growing peril and is no service to the peoples of the United

Nations The earnest appeal of the Working Committee to Great Britain and the United Nations has so far met with ho response, and the criticisms made in many foreign quarters have shown an ignorance of India's and the world's need, and sometimes even hostility to India's freedom, which is significant of a mentality of domination and racial superiority which cannot be tolerated by a proud people conscious of their strength and of the justice of their cause.

"The A. I. C. C. would yet again, at this last moment, in the interest of world freedom, renew this appeal to Britain and the United Nations But the Committee feels that it is no longer justified in holding the nation back from endeavouring to assert its will against and imperialist and authoritarian government which dominates over it and prevents it from functioning in its own interest and in the interest of humanity. The Committee resolves, therefore, to sanction for the vindication of India's inalienable right to freedom and independence, the starting of a mass struggle on non-violent lines on the widest possible scale. so that the country might utilise all the non-violent strength it has gathered during the last twenty two years of peaceful struggle Such a struggle must inevitably be under the leadership of Gandhiji and the Committee requests him to take the lead and guide the nation in the steps to be taken.

"The Committee appeals to the people of India to face the dangers and hardships that will fall to their lot with courage arid endurance, and to hold together under the leadership of Gandhiji, and carry out his instructions as disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom, whey must remember that non-violence is the basis of this movement, A time may come when it may riot be possible to issue instructions or for instructions to reach our people, and when no Congress Committees can function. When this happens, every man and woman, who is participating in this movement must function for him self or her self within the four corners of the general instructions issued. Every Indian who desires freedom and strives for it must be his own guide urging him on along the hard road where there is no resting place and which leads along ultimately to the independence and deliverance of India.

"Lastly, whilst the A.I.C.C. has stated its own view of the future governance under free India, the A.I.C.C. wishes to make it quite clear to all concerned that by embarking on mass struggle it has no intention of gaining power for the Congress. The power when it comes, will belong to the whole people of India."

Do Or Die

Nothing Less Than Freedom

Speaking on the resolution after it was passed, Mahatma Gandhi said that he would want freedom immediately, "This very night before dawn if it can be had." The text of the speech follows.

"I congratulate you on the resolution that you have just passed. I also congratulate three comrades on the courage they have shown in pressing their amendments to a division, even though they knew that there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the resolution, and I congratulate the thirteen friends who voted against the resolution. In doing so, they had nothing to be ashamed of. For the last twenty years we have tried to learn not to lose courage even when we are in a hopeless minority and are laughed at. We have learned to hold on to our beliefs in the confidence that we are in the right. It behoves us to cultivate this courage of conviction, for it ennobles man and raises his moral stature. I was-, therefore, glad to see that these friends had imbibed the principle which I have tried to follow for the last fifty years and more.

"Having congratulated them on their courage, let me say that what they asked this Committee to accept through their 'amendments was not the correct representation of the situation. These friends ought to have pondered over the appeal made to them by the Maulana to withdraw their amendments; they should have carefully followed the explanations given by Jawaharlal. Had they done so, it would have been clear to them that the right which they now want the Congress to concede has already been conceeded by the Congress.

"The Congress has no sanction but the moral one for enforcing its decisions. It believes that true democracy can only be the outcome of non-violence. The structure of a world federation car

be raised only on a foundation of non-violence, and violence will have to be totally abjured from world affairs.

"The Congress has agreed to submitting all the differences to an impartial international tribunal and to abide by its decision If even this fairest of proposals is unacceptable, the only course that remains open is that of sword, of violence, How can I persuade myself to agree to an impossibility? To demand the vivisection of a living organism is to ask for its very life. It is a call to war. The Congress cannot be party to such a fratricidal war.

"I, therefore, want freedom immediately, this very night, before dawn, if it can be had. Freedom cannot now wait for the realization of communal unity. If that unity is not achieved, sacrifices necessary for it will have to be much greater than would have otherwise sufficed. But the Congress must win freedom or be wiped out in the effort. And forget not that the freedom which the Congress is struggling to achieve will not be for the Congressmen alone but for all the forty crores of the Indian people. Congressmen must forever remain humble servants of the people.

"It is not a make-believe that I am suggesting to you. It is the very essence of freedom. The bond of' the slave is snapped the moment he considers himself to be a free being. He will plainly tell the master: I was your bondage till this moment, but I am a slave no longer You may kill me if you like, but you keep me alive, I wish to tell you that if you release me from the bondage of your own accord, I will ask for nothing more from you. You used to feed and clothe me, though I could have provided food and clothing for myself by my labour I hitherto depended on you instead of on God, for food and raiment God has now inspired me with an urge for freedom and I am today a free man and will no longer depend on you"

"You may take it from me that I am not going to strike a bargain with the Viceroy for ministries and the like lam not going to be satisfied with anything short of complete freedom Maybe, he will propose the abolition of salt tax, the drink evil, etc But I will say 'Nothing less than freedom.' Here is a mantra, a short one that I give you. You may imprint it on your hearts and let every

breath of yours give expression to it. The mantra is: 'Do or Die.' We shall either free India or die in the attempt; we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery. Every true Congressman or (Congress) woman will join the struggle with an inflexible determination not to remain alive to see the attempt; we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery Congressman or (Congress) woman will join the struggle with an inflexible determination not to remain alive to see the country in bondage and slavery. Let that be your pledge. Keep jails out of your consideration. If the Government keep me free, I will spare you the trouble o the jails. I will not put on the Government the strain of maint3ining a large number of prisoners at a time when it is in trouble. Let every man and woman live every moment of his or her life hereafter in the consciousness that he or she eats or lives for achieving freedom and will, die, if need be, to attain the goal. Take a pledge with God Sand your own conscience as witness, that you will no longer rest till freedom is achieved and will be prepared to lay down your lives in the attempt to achieve it. He who loses his life will gain it; he who will seek t save it shall lose it. Freedom is not for the coward or the fainthearted.

A word to the journalists. I congratulate you on the support you have hitherto given to the national demand. I known the restrictions and handicaps under which you have to labour. But I would now ask you to snap the chains that bind you. It should be the proud privilege of the news to lead and set an example in laying down one's life for freedom. You have the pen which the Government can't suppress. I know you have large properties in the form of printing-presses, etc., and you would be afraid lest the Government should attach them. I do not ask you to invite an attachment of the printing- press voluntarily. For myself, I would, not suppress my pen, even if the press was to be attached. As you know my press was attached in the .past and returned later on. But I do not ask from you that final sacrifice. I suggest a middle way. You should now wind up your Standing Committee, and you may declare that you will give up writing under the present restrictions and take up the pen only when India has won her freedom. You may tell Sir Frederick Puckle that he can't expect

from you a command performance, that his Press notes are full of untruth, and that will refuse to publish them. You will openly declare that you are wholeheartedly with the Congress. If you do this, you will have changed the atmosphere before the fight actually begins.

"Soldiers too are covered by the present programme. I do not ask them just now to resign their posts and leave the army. Soldiers come to me, Jawaharlal and to the Maulana and say: "We are wholly with you. We are tired of the government tyranny." To these soldiers I would say: "You may say to the Government, 'Our hearts are with the Congress. We are not going to leave our posts. We will serve you so long we receive you salaries. We will obey your just orders, but will refuse to fire on our own people."

"To those who lack the courage to do this much I have nothing to say. They will go their own way. But if you can do this much, you may take if from me that the whole atmosphere will be electrified. Let the Government then shower bombs, if they like. But no power on earth will then be able to keep you in bondage any longer.

"If the students want to join the struggle only to go back to their studies after a while, I would not invite them to it. For the present, however, 'till the time that I frame a programme for the struggle, I would ask the students to say to their professors: 'We belong to the Congress. Do you belong to-the Congress or to the Government? If you belong to the Congress, you need not vacate your post. You will remain at your posts but teach us and lead us unto freedom.' In all fights for freedom, the world over, the students have made very large contributions."

"If in the interval that is left to us before the actual fight begins, you do even the little I have suggested to you, you will have changed the atmosphere and will have prepared the ground for the next step."

It is Going to be a Fight to Finish

In his speech, Jawaharlal Nehru who had moved the resolution 'himself, said that it was going to be fight to finish.

"The conception of resolution is not narrow nationalism, but it not narrow nationalism, but it has an international background. The arguments for the resolution have already been sufficiently put before the public. I am sure the bona fides of the resolution have been fully understood by all friends. The resolutions is in no sense a challenge to anyone. If the British Government accept the proposed it would change the positions both internal and international, for the better from every point of view. The position of China would be improved. I am convinced that whatever change might come about in India, it must be for the better. The A.I.C.C. knows that Mahatma Gandhi has agreed that the British and other foreign armed forces stationed in India may continue. This has been agreed to in order not to allow the Japanese to come in."

"I am surprised how intelligent people .in England and America could have misunderstood the Congress stand unless, of course, they deliberately chose to misunderstand it. I have regretfully come to the conclusion that to some extent other governments are also following the British line of thought towards India. Today, the British Government is opposed to the Indian national movement for freedom. I am convinced that the British Government can never really think in terms of advancing the cause of the freedom of India unless, of course, the entire character of the present British Government is changed I am not personally concerned with such a change, but I stand for dissociating myself with that government anti that country. It is not for me to advise the British people what government they should have.

"There is a great deal of criticism in America, too, about what India wants We are accused, by some newspapers, that we are blackmailing It is curious charge for a people to make who themselves had for generations carried on a struggle for freedom If for demanding freedom we are called blackmailers then surely our understanding of the English language has been wrong. Whatever may happen in Whitehall, it is not going to stop us from working for our independence. We live for it and will die for it. I do not want to say anything at the present moment which might add to the feeling of bitterness that exists everywhere. I know that

this War has produced great emotional reactions in people's minds which is one of the worst effects of the War and which makes it very difficult for the people to think and not to think in terms of violent hatred.

"Nobody in Whitehall can think straight, I suppose. There is falsity everywhere. You listen to the. r London, Berlin or Tokyo. One does not know what is the truth. I am prepared to make many allowances for the emotional background in England and America. I do not really mind if people there angry. But I feel sorry for the people in England and America who have a perverted way of looking at the Indian question. They are so wrong that they will certainly land themselves in difficulty. After all, just think what would have been the course of history; particularly that of Britain, if she had taken right steps with regard to India in the last two years If Britain had acted rightly, the entire history of the War would have been different. But in spite of perils and disasters, England has stuck to her imperialism and "rapier. The fact is patent to me that the British Government and, for certain, the Government of India think the Indian National Congress to be their enemy number one. If the Government of India is going to treat the people of India like this, then we also know how to behave with them. We have seen in the last few months unparalleled example of inefficiency and in competency of this government. The whole system is a rotten one. I do not want to associate myself with the creaking, shaking machinery that the Government of India is. As for the so-called National War Front, there is neither the nation, nor the war, nor any front in it. All that this front is now doing is opposing the Congress. I certainly do not mind that. The whole Government of India is built that way. The only occasion when it does function actively and efficiently is when overnight it starts rounding up large numbers of people. One of these some such efficient functioning will reappear against Congressmen!

'It is curious tangle that we are in. It is not going to be resolved by shouting or by the approaches of the British Government. May I, with all respect, suggest to the great people of America that they have all gone wrong in regard to India, China and the whole of

Asia. Americans. have looked upon India as an appendage to Britain, and Asia as the dependent of E rope and America. Some of them have thought in terms of benevolence towards these countries, but always with a taint of road superiority They have s considered themselves, because of their inventions during this machine age, to be infinitely. Better then us and also that we are a benighted back people. But the people of Asia do no propose to be that manner any longer. Asia is the mother-continent of the world, and India and China constitute the real mother countries of the-world, What is the good of such people, who', simply because they have some very great material achievements to their credit, have forgotten or are not learning the very essence and art of living? They have built and are building better motorcars. This is .a machine age. We will also learn to build machines-better machines. Americans have forgotten the magnificent achievements of China and India. It is China and India, with the experience of ages, who have learned the art of living decently even without the material achievements considered necessary for such living.

"I hate poverty. My grievance against the British is that they has made Indians miserable, poverty stricken wrecks of humanity. We are now taking a step from which there will be no going back. If there is goodwill on other side, then everything would be all right and the whole course of the War and future of the world would be changed. The change would be not merely emotional but in the material sense also. But that is not to be. There might be some difficulty. It is my conviction that this resolution is the only way, the effective way, in which we can help china and Russia and I know how terrible the situation is there. Britain and America must change their whole conception of the War. It is no good looking at Asia as a side-show. Asia is the centre of the War and it is Asia that is going to determine the final result of the War. Therefore, I want to prepare today, even at some risk and peril, so that the final result of the War should be the right kind of result. We must go forward even though it involves certain perils. I should like-my friends, who do not agree with this resolution or who do not try to understand it, to respect our bona fieds. People should realise that if there is any trouble in India, it is we who

would suffer. If there is internal trouble or an external invasion by Japan, it is we who would suffer, England might he distantly affected but we have to die immediately. The problem of meeting aggression concerns us deeply. How can I, after seeing the incompetence of the government, trust them? Their whole attitude is one of retreat. We, however, want to be valiant fighters. It is not a narrow nationalist resolution. I am proud of Indian nationalism because if is broadbased and has an international background.

"The movement contemplated is not for merely achieving national ends but for achieving world freedom. The Congress is plunging into a stormy ocean and it would emerge either with a free India or go down. Unlike in the past, it is not going to be a movement for a few days, to be suspended and talked over. It is going to be a fight to the finish. The Congress has now burnt its boats and is about to embark on a desperate campaign. I can never persuade myself to work with a government which has neither vision nor intelligence. Nor would I remain a passive spectator of the great happenings that are taking place in the world. It appears to me, perhaps, I would live in eternal opposition to the Axis power. I repudiate the suggestion that the Congress amid Mahatma Gandhi are bargaining and haggling. In moments of excitement people are prone to say certain things, but this should not be dubbed. as bargaining. How, by granting India's independence, would the war efforts of the United Nations be hampered or how would chaos and anarchy follow in India? The resolution does not give out even one tenth of the real feelings of the Indians towards the British Government.

"The debate on this resolution is over and I have also had my say. There are just a few points which I have partly said and partly not said-which I would like to say in English for the benefit of my friends who may not have followed me.

"What is the resolution? You have seen and read it. It is not a threat. It is not an invitation. It is an explanation. It is an offer of cooperation. It is all that. It is not a threat but still behind it there is obvious warning that certain consequences will follow if

certain not happen. It is an offer of cooperation but of a free India with other-free peoples. There is going to be no cooperation on any ether terms. On any other terms this resolution can only, promise conflict and struggle. Let that be clear. Some of our friends abroad may think that we are acting unwisely. I do not blame them. They move in their own environment, I waist them to realise what we are saying. We are in dead earnest about the course we are going to adopt. Let there be no doubt about it. You may occasionally cheer and clap but the fact is that we are on the brink of a precipice and we are in dead earnest about it. I think this resolution of ours is not only a resolution of the All India Congress Committee but it does represent as on many other occasion our resolutions have represented-the voice of India. I would even go a step further and say that it represents the voice-of the entire oppressed humanity. If, by a miracle, Britain had accepted this resolution and acted according to its demands you would have seen such a wonderful change, not only in India but all over the world. It would have changed the whole nature of the War.

"Now, remember that the essential thing about this War is that it is something infinitely more than a war; it is a World War. That is big enough; but it is bigger than that: it is a part of, and to prelude to, and precursor of a vast revolution that is enveloping the whole world. This War may end or it it may be carried on for sometime, but no peace will be established, no equilibrium attained until this revolution runs, its appointed course. Our misfortune has been that the leaders in the West did not realize the revolutionary significance of this War, o if they realized, they did not act accordingly. They are still carrying in the same old way and think only in terms of more tanks and more aeroplanes. Probably in their position I would have done the same thing. They are not thinking of the vast surge of the elemental emotion of humanity. Unless they do this, they can never attain success. I hope they will learn, but sometimes, I hear, that they will learn, it too late.

"Mr. Churchill and other Englishmen have not got over thinking in terms of the Anglo-Saxon race. In a recent speech Mr.

Churchill visualised the day when the Anglo-Saxon race would march through the world in dignity and majesty. This is not a pleasant picture to contemplate and it is a thing not going to be tolerated by Asia at any rate. Let that be clear. There is too much talk of majesty and dignity of the Anglo-Saxon race or the German race or the Italian race.

There are other races also in the world and we have had enough of such talks, This racial superiority can no more be tolerated. We are-going to cooperate with the British when we think it right to do so and when there is a right cause; but we are not going to act with that we think that the cause is not right At the present time, the Allied cause is only negatively right in the sense that Germany and Japan are worse But Indian freedom would change the whole nature of the War and m it right positively Even the P: of Nazi Germany and those who are helping the Germans would feel the impact of the change. It would be a turning point of the War. Bt they simply talk about their own problems which have no significance for us and ask us not to do this and that and go oil in their own ruts.

The people in England, America and elsewhere looking at 'question from the narrow standpoint of a soldier. And it does not matter to them how other people view the Indian question. India says something which, we believe-and I honestly believe-is not only in the interest of India but enormously in the interest of the Allied cause provided they accept it. They talk about blackmailing and threaten us. I can only tell them that we will not be deterred from our course by any amount of threats on the other hand Westerners ought to realise that at this stage threats could only make the position Infinitely worse and more difficult for them. We have decided to take this course on which there is no going back. I repeat again: we shall try to remain calm.

We have got big t ahead-a big task for our country, and a big task for the world. Whether we function as Indian National Congress or not, time may come when each individual will represent the Indian National Congress and work on his own. We must not in the excitement of the movement forget our high aims

and objectives-high aims for India whose freedom we consider precious, and high aims and objectives-with regard to the whole world. We are nationalists and we are proud of this fact. But we should not settle down to a narrow nationalism. We should always remember that we have develop a right type of internationalism but not pseudo-internationalism, of the present day world or of the league of Nations.

"I beg everybody to 'consider this resolution in this spirit. Whether there are internal perils or external perils, after all, if the Japanese reach this country, you and I will suffer and not the people in London and Washington. You and I will have to die, face the situation, may have to face untold miseries and sufferings-we will have to face all that. People talk to us from Washington, New York and various other places. You know what Japan is. We know what subjection is and we know it better than Americans and Englishmen. We have had it for about two hundred years. We have come to the decision that it is better-to throw off the fetters into the fire and come out as a free nation than be reduced to ashes.

"We are prepared to pay any price for unity except 'the price of independence. What obstructions have not been placed in our path which have had no relation to the real issue? I can talk and negotiate with anybody who recognises the need for democratic freedom for India, but I Cannot negotiate with anyone who refuses to recognise the fundamental issue-the freedom of India. I was told during the Cripps negotiations that a certain leader insisted on behalf of Muslims that the Victory's power of veto should not be removed or in any way qualified If any section wants that the British Viceroy should exercise his veto power against the decisions of his Indian cabinet, it means clearly that that section is against the freedom of India. I do not want to injure anyone's feelings especially at a time when we ace about to launch a great struggle for freedom. I tried, for one whole year, to find out what the League wanted, but I was unable to understand what they wanted.

"I have not been able to find a parallel to such a situation in the history of the world. I have not come across anywhere else

such a situation except in the land of Hitler. The Sudden crisis bears similarity to the situation here. For purposes of negotiations we were not allowed to select our own representatives. We are told that we cannot send Muslims to represent the Congress.

This is an insult to our great organization and to our revered President. We were prepared to stake everything consistent with our dignity and self-respect for finding a satisfactory settlement. Whenever we knocked at the doors we found them bolted, and we knocked ourselves against a wall. Are we beggars to be treated like this? Are we going to be so dishonourable as to sacrifice the mansion of Indian freedom which we want to build? Are we going to be kicked about by men who have made no sacrifice for the freedom of India and who can never think in terms of freedom at all?"

The broad outlines of the events of 1942 are quite well known by this time. The carefully prepared plan of the Government was put into operation and before day-break on August 8, Gandhiji and other leaders were spirited away to unknown prisons. The place of imprisonment of the Working Committed members was kept a well guarded secret for a long time.

The A.I.C.C. members were arrested at Bombay or in trains on their way home. The Congress Committees everywhere were declared unlawful bodies and Congress Offices were seized and locked. Swaraj Bhawan was occupied and all provincial headquarters in all provinces were simultaneously taken possession of. Even social service organisations like Khadi and Harijan centres were not spared.

At Bombay, the entire police and military force was mobilised. Tear gas and lathis were used and rally of Deshsevikas was one of the targets. This was repeated all over the country in various provinces.

The spontaneous resistance began from the people equally promptly. Mrs. Asaf Ali hoisted the flag at Bombay despite police warning and there were processions and demonstrations, not only in Bombay but in far off towns and villages against the arrest of the leaders.

Revolution Spreads

Bombay: The city of Bombay served as the focal point and the Headquarters of the movement. Congress Socialist Party gave such guidance and co-ordination to the movement as was possible, under the circumstances. Students and Labourers played a great role in Bombay. A few mills in Bombay remained closed for about a week but there was a-complete strike for over three months in all the mills in Ahmedabad. 50,000-workers sacrificed and suffered and went hack to their native places while the mill owners were carrying on war business. The students observed hartals, took out processions and played a hide and seek game with the police in a prolonged struggle.

Bihar: It was in the villages that the movement assumed a mass character. Bihar was perhaps the most widely affected province in the whole country. This province and the eastern parts of U.P. had and a strategic position. The lifeline for war supplies to the eastern front passed through this area. The target of attack in Bihar was the communications, railway stations, roads and bridges as well as police stations and the courts and other Government buildings. Trouble in Bihar started with the firing on a peaceful procession in Bihar Secretariat compound on the 10th August.

U P: After Bihar, the movement was most widespread in the United Province The district of Ballia specially distinguished itself. On 10th August, the District Magistrate at Ballia under pressure of a demand from the people had to release the arrested Congress leaders of the district, and people took over the Government and the officials had to take refuge in the police lines in a panic All communications with the outside world were cut off from the 11th. For 9 days the town and district was entirely ruled by the people. There was no crime during this period and there was all round peace. On August 19th the 'invasion' force appeared and Ballia was reconquered. The U.P. Government was headed by 'strong' man, Mr. Hallett and he wanted to teach a lesson to the rebels of Ballia and other equally rebellious places- Madhuban in Azamgar, Shaganj and other places in Gorakhpur, The police

started a furious campaign of burning houses, shooting men, women and children and looting whatever they could get. A reign of terror now prevailed for a week. In the towns of U.P. at Lucknow, Meerut, Allahabad and Benares the same story repeated itself. The police provoked peaceful procession, opened fire and killed men to terroise them. The students including girls often faced lathi charges and many of them received bullet wounds. It is estimated that over three hundred girls received injure. There was a procession at Allahabad headed by a batch of University girls.

C. P: Like U. P., the province of C. P. also brought some unknown places on the map of India. These are Chimur, Ashti, Ramtek, Yavli and others. Chimur is a jungle district with a population of 6000. On 16th August a peaceful procession in the district was greeted by lathis and bullets and the local leaders were arrested. Infuriated mob had a clash with the police and a S.I. was killed and Government buildings were burnt up and the bridges and roads were damaged and blocked. This brought the troops on the 17th. A similar sequence of events repeated itself at Ashti where highly respected Congress leaders were shot down by the police.

Maharashtra: In Maharashtra the district of Satara became famous in 1942 as a site of Patri-Sarkar Sata had earned similar fame in the early Satyagraha movement of 1930-32. In 1942, when the resistance in the rural areas, as elsewhere, had been suppressed by ruthless repression, the underground workers organised a parallel Government at Satara. Such an experiment was possible in this hilly area, with various Indian States bordering on the British India districts.

The experiment of course did not last long and would have been completely crushed by military force of the Government but for the fact that the Working Committee members were released and the political atmosphere in the country took a different turn.

Punjab, Assam & Sind: Other provinces such as Assam, Orissa, Sind and the Punjab gave a good account of themselves. The pattern of events in all these places was similar. Mass demonstration were held against the arrest of the leaders, and

police firing. Incidents of sabotage followed ruthless repression. The conditions in the Punjab were particularly difficult and the task of the underground workers was specially hazardous. The district of Rawalpindi, which was, by-the way, the military Headquarters of the British Government, played the most distinguished part.

N.W.F.P: Under the guidance of Badshah Khan, the movement remained perfectly peaceful in he land of the brave pathans. It began with mass demonstrations, processions and picketing of liquor shops, till 4th September, 1942, when the Congress and the Khudai Khidmatgars repudiated the British Raj in the province. Badshah Khan and his party started on fraternal marches in the villages and roused tremendous enthusiasm.

Final phase of the movement, after a month, took the form of organised raids on Law Courts throughout the province, in a strictly non-violent manner Khudai Khidmatgars were injured in a large number by lathi charges and were later fired upon and killed. Efforts at demoralisation having failed, the Government was now forced to resort to arrests. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan headed a force of volunteers for 'raid' or for taking possessions of Mardan Law Court, as a symbol of the Government authority. He was severely beaten and had to b removed to jail an unconscious state with his two ribs broken. Only one case of looting of a post office was reported n this province and this was condemned unequivocally when Badshah Khan came to know of it.

Bengal: In Bengal, serious trouble had developed by the ruthless action of the police in Calcutta and tram car and other traffic was completely dislocated. Roads were barricaded for a number of days. The police and the military opened fire several times in various parts of the city. A secret radio station also worked in Calcutta as in Bombay for a long time till all its workers were arrested. The movement in Calcutta was carried on mostly by the students and the enthusiasm was unprecedented even in the history of Bengal, The repression that followed was equally unprecedented. For six long months, people in Calcutta resisted doggedly the mighty concentration of the' police and military.

Jails were filled with the arrested men and women, There were workers' strikes in military workshops.

1942 movement revealed the strength and daring initiative of our people in the villages in away that makes every Indian proud and happy, even those who might not like the incidents of murders and violence that marred the movement from the Congress point of view. The first place among various districts and provinces, that distinguished themselves in 1942, is that of Midnapore.

Although the movement did not bring about immediate it prepared the ground for independence in 1947. After the revolt, no doubt was left in the minds of the British rulers that the days of their domination were numbered. It was only a question of time. The revolt marked the culmination of the Indian freedom movement. It have utterance to India's anger against imperialism and her determination to be free.

Plans of Freedom

The suppression and frustration of the aspirations of the people during the War gave birth to an irresistible upsurge. The British administration had been showing signs of complete bankruptcy. The desperate attempts to divert the popular upsurge into fratricidal channels of communal strife had only depended the crisis. This policy had weakened and demoralised the administrative apparatus and had given rise to corruption, inefficiency and a deepening food crisis. It also had spread contempt for law and Order and the menace of a general conflagration loomed on the horizon.

The Quit India Movement and the emergence of the phenomenon of AZAD HIND FAUJ had made the situation in the country very explosive. Further, the British found it difficult to cope with the changed international situation. Also a Labour Government had come into power in Britain after a dramatic ouster of the War hero, Mr. Winston Churchill.

In this state of affairs, in the words of Sir Stafford Cripps, there were fundamentally two alternatives before the Government. First, they could endeavour to strengthen British control in India

on the basis of a considerable reinforcement of British troops. The second alternative was to accept the fact that the, first alternative was not possible.

The two events that accelerated the British decision to reach a settlement before the situation passed entirely out of their hands were the trial of the I.N.A. prisoners and the revolt of Indian naval service.

Successive Plans

Three successive Plans were proposed: Cabinet Mission Plan in June, '46, Attlee Declaration in February, '47 and lastly the Mount batten Plan of June, '47. One common factor of all these Plans, as of the earlier Cripps proposals was, the building up of an elaborate structure based on the communal lines.

'The political scene in India at that time was marked by negotiations between the British Government, League and the Congress: the Congress eager to attain country's freedom, the British eager to make a formal transfer and at the same time, trying to protect the British political, economic and strategic interests, in several parts of India , and the League playing what it thought to be a clever game of 'Carving out a separate State, for Muslims.

A delegation of British M.P.'s was sent to India in early January, 1946 to ascertain the views of the Indian leaders. Prof. Laski, the political philosopher of the Labour Party had expressed his fear that unless Britain settled with India, "it may be too late after the summer." The M.P.s later reported to Premier Attlee saying that I.N.A. dominated the Indian scene and that labour unrest and impending famine would be very grave factors to reckon with.

Mr. Attlee announced on February 19, 1946 that a Mission consisting of three Cabinet members would visit India shortly On the very next day the leader of the M.'P.'s delegation said, "We must quit India quickly or we shall be kicked out." Mr Jinnah on his part said that Pakistan would be the guiding principle of his talks with Britain.

Cabinet Mission

The British Cabinet Mission consisting of Lord P Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Albert V. Alexander arrived in India towards the end of March and after interviewing the leaders of different groups, parties and communities arranged a Conference at Simla. This Conference lasted about a week and broke down on the issue of Pakistan and parity in the proposed interim Government. Though unsuccessful, the Simla Conference cleared the issues and in a way subsequent, plans followed from it.

The Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy then issued a statement on May 16 1946, saying that though no agreement had been reached, immediate arrangements should be made whereby Indians may decide the future constitution of India and an Interim Government be set up until the new constitution could be brought into being.

The statement pointed out that after examining the question of a separate and fully independent sovereign state of Pakistan as claimed by the Muslim League, the Mission had come to the conclusion that "the setting up of a separate sovereign state of Pakistan on the lines claimed by the Muslim League would not solve the communal minority problem, nor can we see any justification for including within a sovereign Pakistan those districts of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam in which the population is predominantly non-Muslim " They considered, further, whether a smaller sovereign Pakistan, confined to the Muslim majority areas alone, might be a possible basis of a compromise, but they felt that "neither a larger nor a smaller sovereign state of Pakistan would provide an acceptable solution for the communal problem." In the end, they said: "We are, therefore, unable to advise the British Government that the power which at present resides in British hands should be handed over to two entirely separate sovereign states."

Interim Government Announced

Meanwhile, the Viceroy continued negotiations with the representatives of the Congress and the Muslim League on the

number of members and personnel of the proposed Interim Government As these negotiations did not result in an agreement between the parties, the Viceroy announced the names of the candidates for the Interim Government consisting of six Hindus, all members of the Congress, including one member of the Depressed Classes, five Muslim representatives of the Muslim League, one Sikh, one Christian and one Parsi.

On the 25th of June, 1946, the Congress Working Committee announced their rejection of the plan of an Interim Government. They adopted a comprehensive resolution saying that the "Congress can never give up the national character of the Congress, or accept an artificial and unjust parity or agree to the veto of communal group The Committee are unable to accept the proposals for the formation of an interim Government as contained in the Government's statement of June 16. The Committee, however, decided that the Congress should join the proposed Constituent Assembly with a view to framing the Constitution of a free, united and democratic India." The Muslim League accepted the plan with certain provisions. But in view, of the refusal of the Congress to join the Interim Government, Lord Wavell announced on June 26, 1946 that he would set up a temporary 'caretaker' Government of officials to carry on in the interim period.

The Council of the All-India Muslim League met towards the end of July and passed a resolution withdrawing its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission proposals. By another resolution, the Council resolved that 'now the time has come for the Muslim nation to resort to direct action to achieve Pakistan, to assert their just rights, to vindicate their honour and to get rid of the present British slavery and the contemplated future 'caste- Hindu domination.'

The Viceroy invited Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on' 6th of August to constitute an interim Government, which he did.' It consisted of six Hindus, including one Depressed Class member, 'three Muslims, of whom two belonged neither to the Congress nor to the League, one Sikh, one Christian-and one Parsi. The members took office on September 2, 1946.

The League Brought into the Interim Government

Soon after the In Government was formed, the Viceroy started negotiations with the Muslim League with a view to bringing in its representatives and inducing them 'to join it. The League was, however, required to accept the Statement of May 16 and thereby indicate their readiness to join the Constituent Assembly before they could be admitted into the Interim Government. Lord Wavell, it would appear, did not get a clear decision from the League on that point. He assumed that Mr. Jinnah had accepted the stipulation regarding acceptance of the Statement of May 16 and accordingly invited him to nominate five persons to the Interim Government. The League joined the Interim Government in the last week of October, 1946. The League -however were not prepared to accept the Interim Government as a Cabinet, but only as an Executive Council under the Government of India Act.

A deadlock was often created and the position became more and more difficult, and a demand was made on behalf of the Congress that the Muslim League Members should accept the Statement of May 16 and decide to join the Constituent Assembly and recognise the basis of working the Interim Government, or go out of the Interim Government.

On invitation from the British Government Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Baldev Singh, Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Liaqat Au Khan went to London with Lord Wavell in the last week of November, 1946 for discussions which, as was not unexpected, failed to bring about an agreed settlement.

June 3rd Statement-the Mountbatten Plan

Lord Mountbatten had first sent some of his Advisers under Lord Ismay to consult with His Majesty's Government, and subsequently he himself flew to London. He returned to India with a statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and the authority to such steps as were necessary to effect transfer of power. The statement was published simultaneously in India and London on June 3, 1947. It laid down the method for ascertaining the wishes of those Provinces and parts of the country which,

were supposed to be in favour of secession, and in case of division was decided upon, the procedure to effect that division If the decision by a of them was in favour of a division of the Province. The Province was to be divided and the boundaries were to be settled by a Boundary Commission which would take into consideration all factors and not only the population of a district, "-in determining the boundaries. The statement announced that legislation would be introduced in Parliament conferring Dominion Status on India, then almost immediate and that if division was decided upon in India, then there would be two Dominions, otherwise only one Paramountcy would cease simultaneously with the establishment of cominion Status. It was expected that legislation will be completed and power transferred by the middle of August at the latest, thus anticipating the dead originally fixed, for transfer of power by ten months or so.

North West Frontier Province was asked to decide the question by a referendum an4in the British Baluchistan same method was to be adopted for ascertaining the wishes of the people. As regards' Assam, there was only one district, Sylhet, which had a Muslim majority, and in case it was decided that Bengal should be partitioned, a referendum was to be held in Sylhet district to decide whether it should continue to form part of Ass or be amalgamated with the Province of Eastern Bengal. This statement of policy was accepted by the Working Committee of the Congress, and its acceptance was later endorsed by the A.I.C.C. The Council of the All-India Muslim League accepted the plan at a meeting held on June 9, 1947 with certain reservations.

As was expected the division was decided in the Punjab- and the Bengal. The referendum resulted in N W F Provinces, Baluchistan and parts of Assam joining the seceding parts of India. The referendum in the N.W.F. had taken place in opposition of the strong protest and boycott of the party in power there, Dr. Khans party, who had only recently been returned in a clear majority in the provincial elections. The Indian Independence Act was passed by the British Parliament in July 1947 and on 14th August, M.A. Jinnah was declared the Governor General of Pakistan.

Riots - Partition - Riots

During 1946-47, while the political settlement was keeping our leaders feverishly busy, the situation on the ground was anything Jut good. Communal strife resulting from the Muslim League's attitude had become the order of the day.

League's Direct Action

In pursuance of its resolution passed on July 29, the Muslim League had fixed August 16 as 'Direct Act-ion Day', to be observed by Muslims all over the country. Demonstrations were organized on a large scale, and in Bengal, the day was declared a public holiday by the League Ministry in spite of protests from all classes outside the League. The day opened in Calcutta with rioting, loot, murder and arson, which lasted for several days causing immense loss of life and property. Communal rioting broke out in several other places also. The riots in Calcutta were followed shortly afterwards by a very serious outbreak in East Bengal, in the district of Noakhali which spread to the adjoining districts of Comilla, Chittagong, Dacca, etc The Hindus suffered terribly. The news of the atrocities committed in Calcutta and in Noakhali reached Bihar from where large numbers used to go to Bengal for employment and there was very serious rioting in Bihar, and in 'some parts of the U.P. Some time later, the riots started in the North West Frontier Province and the Punjab where the Hindu and the Sikhs were subjected to tremendous loss of life and property.

Gandhiji in Noakhali

In November, 1946, reports of large scale disturbances in Noakhali shook Gandhiji as he rushed from Delhi to Calcutta on his way to Naokhali. In Calcutta, he heard about the disturbances in Bihar. Gandhiji's threat to fast unto death and the energetic efforts of the Interim Government did bring about a quick end to riots in Bihar. In Naokhali, Gandhiji went about staying in Muslim houses, trekking from place to place In the special batch of his chosen companions and workers there were several young women, Sushila Nair, his granddaughter and daughter-in law,

Sucheta and a Muslim lady, Bhen Amtul Salam. Dr. Pattabhi describes the role of Gandhiji in Noakhal.i as follows:

> *"In all this harrowing tale of woe, of families wiped out, villages burnt, women raped, abducted and forcibly married, in this tragedy which has outdone the tragedies of history, the notorious Armenian massacres of old, the Black and Tan pogroms of Ireland, and the more recent slaughter of Jews in Germany, there remains but one bright spot, one shining light, one solitary individual, marching alone and unfriended, melancholy and slow throughout the marshes of East Bengal, witnessing forborne houses by the thousand and forsaken families by the million, carrying however with him the torch of hope and peace, exhorting people to shed fear, and learn to believe, dwelling upon the essential good in human nature and the ultimate triumph of love over hatred, holding aloft the torch of Truth in the midst of untruth, of light in the midst of darkness and of life in the midst of death."*

Riots Spread

But while Gandhiji's work at Noakhali was having a sobering effect in Bengal Bihar and U P it was considered by the League as a sabotage of its doctrine of hatred and two nations. On the day Direct Action had been inaugurated by the League at Delhi, Mr. Feroz Khan Noon and Mr. Ghazanfar Ali prophesied happenings that would put the memory of Changiz and, Qatlu Khan into shade. These prophecies were soon realised in the' districts of Rawalpindi and Multan. These districts had been 'the recruiting ground of the British Indian army, with most backward, fanatical and ignorant people. Many of these ex-servicemen had arms and the war had brutalised them even more. Across the border were the backward frontier districts, ever ready for loot and rapine. The minority communities, Sikhs and Hindus were either in the towns or in isolated small pockets and had lived peacefully for generations with their neighbours. Then suddenly these villages found themselves surrounded by thousands of armed gangs of marauders. The villages were looted, and burnt; men, women and chil4ren maimed and killed, women abducted and

dish9noured. Many women jumped into wells or burnt themselves and men shot their own families to save them from torture and dishonour. Charigiz and Qatlu Khan would blush in their graves if their names were associated with such doings as were enacted at Rawalpindi and Multan. These things went on with Impunity and photographs published later in the press, taken from air, showed columns of armed with rifles, some with camels and horses carrying their booty swarming the countryside below. Military aid reached the surviving villages but later. The tales of horror, that were carried by those who escaped, kindled a fire that was later to blaze into a conflagration.

These ghastly happenings were taking place when the League had already joined the Interim Government at the Centre. The League was playing a double role. While on the one hand it openly preached violence and jehad against non-Muslim's, at the same time it held office in the provinces and at the centre controlling police and justice. On being asked his opinion about this, Gandhiji had demand this grave anomaly. "It is so bad that it cannot last long", he had said.

Congress Accepts Mountbatten Plan

In fact it was the horror of this fratricidal war and the failure of the experiment of a composite Government at the centre that ultimately induced the Congress leaders to accept the Mountbatten Plan with severing of some parts, but lesser parts than Jinnah's original demand. Similar earlier offer by Rajaji's formula had been turned down by Jinnah as a "truncated and moth-eaten" Pakistan.

Gandhiji had taken up a stand against vivisection, but recognised that alternative was revolution, or a civil war on one side and a new fight with the British who supported the League demand. The ever- increasing and ever-deepening chain of communal disturbances involving mass murder, arson or loot accompanied by unthinkable atrocities and horrors obliged the Congress Working Committee to consider the entire communal and political situation afresh. The only way out of the difficulty appeared to be the partitioning of India. Jawaharlal Nehru referred to this fact in these words on 3rd of June, 1947: "There has been

violence, shameful, degrading and revolting violence in various parts of the country. This must end." The country, its press and leaders of all schools were taken by surprise and in the majority expressed disapproval and dismay at the acceptance by the Congress of a scheme of division. In the A.I.C.C. meeting, however, there was scarcely any opposition excepting by the valiant fight put up by Sri Purshotam Das Tandon. Nehruji had explained that the alternative was murder. It was not a question of being afraid of being killed, but the killing on both sides was of your own people. Sard Patel said that it was decided to amputate a limb rather than allow the poison to affect the whole body. The A.I.C.C. members including Rajendra Babu expressed their conviction that the decision would restore good arid that with it and the force of economic and other factors there would be a reunion at an early date. The Congress was not happy about the partitioning of India as it had consistently fought for 4he liberation of a united India The following words of Jawaharlal Nehru give an Idea of the working of his inner mind; "For generations we have dreamt and struggled for a free and independent united India. The proposal to allow certain parts to secede, if they so will, is painful for any of us to contemplate.

The poison, it would seem, had became too deep and widespread that the acceptance of Pakistan, instead of having a sobering effect and bringing peace, unleashed the forces that League had been rearing and a fast-developing story of bloodshed, hatred and lawlessness overshadowed the parts that were feeling the glow of the coming Pakistan.

It would also seem that the evil star of India had not ceased to have its baneful influence even while it was setting. The then Punjab Government had the worst type of die-hard civilian officers. They must have found it hard to reconcile themselves to their throwing away of the Empire Some of the Governors like Khizar Hayat Khan tried to tip the balance in favour of the League. The Muslim police and officers had had a free hand inspite of various protests of the minority community. The hidden official hand in spreading of riots was clearly discernable and the worst affected areas were those with European District Officers.

With the opening of the Boundary Commission, these communal riots reached another phase. Hopes were held to some communities of more justice being done, on the basis of the 'Other Factors clause but these were sadly belied in the Boundary award. The patience of the communities was completely exhausted. Tins started a train of incidents of increasing ferocity and magnitude till these merged into an all-out war of one community against the other some unspeakable horrors were committed against women by both sides. The Boundary Commission seem to have added to the strife by taking sides.

Crisis in India's Soul

Thus on the threshold of our freedom, a mounting crisis of frenzy and madness was spreading devastation in the Punjab and for the Sikh and Hindu population of N.W.F.P., Baluchistan and Sindh. Loot and arson, abduction and forcible contusions were going on a mass scale, soon began, a two way tract of miserable, terror-stricken men and women from one part of the country to the other. Many dropped on the roadside out of hunger and exhaustion. Many were killed or abducted on the way.

In long straggling trails of pedestrians cattle, bullock tarts dragging its weary course, uprooted from their ancestral homes, bereft of lands, houses and all belongings, living in momentary terror of marauding bands, people began to move from the two directions to establish Mr. Jinnah's dream of two nations Many million people were thus forced to leave their homes, mostly with bare clothes on their backs, to seek shelter in refugee camps that were by then springing up, and live on such charity as was available.

This Crisis in India s Soul as Nehru put it had almost synchronised with August 15th, though the peak was to come a few days later. Thus we came to live the most humiliating chapter in India's long' history on the eve of her greatest glory.

This human earthquake as Nehru called it had affected not only those who were its victims directly, but had shaken all our cherished ideals and the structure ol our national life to its foundations.

"One Bright Flame"

Recalling the happenings Pandit Nehru said:

'Freedom came to us and it came with minimum of violence. But immediately after, we had to wade though oceans of blood and tears Worse than the blood and tears was the shame and disgrace that accompanied them. Where were our values and standards then, where was our old culture, our humanism and spirituality and all that India had stood for in the past? Suddenly darkness descended upon this land and madness seized the people.

"Fear and hatred blinded our minds and all the restraints which civilization imposes were swept away. Horror piled on horror and a sudden emptiness seized us at the brute savagery of human beings The lights seemed all to go out; not all, for a few still flickered in the raging tempest.

We sorrowed for the dead and the dying and for those whose suffering was greater than that of death. We sorrowed even more for India, our common mother, for whose freedom we had laboured these long years.

"The lights seemed to go out but one bright flame continued to burn and shed its light on the surrounding gloom and, looking at that pure flame strength and hope returned to us and we felt that whatever momentary disaster might overwhelm our people, there was the spirit of India strong and unsullied, rising above the turmoil of the present and not caring for the petty exigencies of the day.

"How many of you realise what it has meant to India to have the presence of Mahatma Gandhi during these months? We all know of his magnificent services to India and to freedom during the past half- century and more.

But no service could have been greater than what he has performed during the past four months when, in a dissolving world, he has been like a rock of purpose and a lighthouse of truth, and his firm, low voice has risen above the clamours of the multitude, pointing out the path of rightful endeavour."

THE DAWN OF FREEDOM

The suffering and the sacrifices of countless men and women finally bore fruit and India woke up to freedom on the midnight of August 14-15. The travails and tribulations had come to an end. The joyous moment of having broken off the shackles of subjugation was there inspite of the pain and agony of Partition. The time had come when we could look forward to the sun of freedom and the opportunity that freedom brings.

The ceremony of the Assumption of Power by India through her chosen representatives in the Constituent Assembly which had begun its Constitution-making activity on Dec. 9, 1946, was fixed to take place on the midnight of August 14-15.

The time chosen was perhaps to commemorate another midnight session, equally memorable, when a similar hazardous journey was undertaken and equally solemn dedication made. Some of the very men and women who took part in the drama on August 14-15-and many others who thronged and cheered on the road outside and lit lamps and put up flags and festoons in towns and villages, had taken part in that earlier session and in the struggle that began on that midnight of Dec. 31. 1929-Jan. 1, 1930 in Lahore.

And yet how different was the setting. The city of thatch and canvass on the banks of the Ravi the biting winter night and this gilded chamber, air-conditioned, lit by chandelier lights, the decorous benches and galleries.

What a tame picture they make when we recall the tumultuous scenes, the midnight revelry led by the Rashtrapati himself, from camp to camp on that earlier midnight. It was strange that a revolution had culminated in this way and an event of such colossal historical importance as the freedom of 400 million people was recorded in this brief manner.

The session in the chamber began at 10-45 P.M. The galleries were full of a colourful crowd. A surging mass had gathered outside. The proceeding commenced with the 'Bande Mataram sung by Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani, the wife of the then Congress President. This was followed by a brief opening address by the

President of the Consembly, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Pandit Nehru then moved the pledge. He made a stirring speech with deep emotion. The motion was seconded by Chaudhury Khaliquzzaman and supported by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. The members of the Constituent Assembly took the pledge of dedicating themselves "to the service of India and her people to the end so that this ancient land attain her rightful and honoured place in the world and make lie, lull and willing contribution to the promotion of world peace and welfare of mankind.

The pledge was read out by Dr. Rajendra Prasad first in Hindi and the in English and repeated sentence by sentence by members rising in their seats, followed In blowing conch-shells and lusty shouts of "Mahatama Gandhi Ki Jai."

Before Pandit Nehru moved the pledge: a two minute silence was observed memory of those who died in the struggle for freedom in India and elsewhere.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad moved the following resolution from the Chair admist thunderous cheer, and acclamation:

> *"I propose that it will be intimated to his Excellency the viceroy that Constituents Assembly of India has assumed the power for the Government of India, and the Constituent Assembly of India has endorsed the recommendation that Lord Mountbatten be the Governor-General of India from August 15, 1947, and that lb is message be conveyed forth with to Lord Mount batten by the President and Pantdit Nehru."*

The house approved it admist acclamation. Mrs. Hansa Mehta then presented the National Flag of India to the Indian Constituent Assembly. In presenting the Flag to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Mrs. Mehta said: "it is in the fitness of things that the first flag that is flying over this august House should be the gift from the women of India.'

Dr. Prasad showed the Flag round. Proceeding came to a close with the singing of "Hindustan Hamara", a poem by Dr. lqbal and "Janaganamana Adhinasaka" by Rabindranath. Mrs. Sucheta KrIpalani conducted the chorus.

A Tryst with Destiny

Moving the resolution prescribing an oath for the members in the Constituent Assembly, free India's first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, declared: Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure, but very substantially. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom.

A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance. it is fitting that at this solemn moment we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger ca of humanity.

At the dawn of history India started on her unending quest, and trackless centuries are filled with her striving and the grandeur of her success and her failures.

Through good and ill fortune alike she has never lost sight of that quest or forgotten the ideals which gave her strength. We end today a period of ill fortune and India discovers herself again. The achievement we celebrate today is but a step, an opening of opportunity, to the greater triumphs and achievements that await us. Ire we brave enough and wise enough to grasp this opportunity and accept the challenge of the future?

Freedom and power bring responsibility. That responsibility rests upon this Assembly, a sovereign body representing the sovereign people of India. Before the birth of freedom we have endured all the pains of labour and our hearts are heavy with the me of this sorrow. Sonic of those pains continue non Nevertheless, the past is over and it is the future that beckons to us now.

That future is not one of these or resting by incessant striving so that we may fulfil the pledges be have so often taken and the one we shall take today. The service of India means the serve of the million who suffer. It means the ending of poverty and

ignorance and d and inequality of opportunity. The ambition of the greatest man of our generation has been to wipe every tear from every eye. That may he beyond us as there are tears and-suffering, so long our work will not be over.

And so we have to labour and to work, and work hard, to give reality to our dreams. Those dreams are for India, but they are also for the world, for all the nations and peoples are too closely knit together today for any one of them to imagine that it can live apart. Peace has been said to he indivisible: so is freedom, so is prosperity now, and so also is disaster in this One World that can no longer be split in to isolated fragments.

To the people of India, whose representatives we are, we make an appeal to join us with faith and confidence in this great adventure. This is no time for petty and destructive criticism, no time for ill-will or blaming other. We have to build the noble mansion of free India where all her children may dwell.

5

Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji

"THE GRAND OLD MAN OF INDIA"

Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917)

Dadabhai Naoroji, the first South Asian Member of Parliament, was born in 1825, the son of a Parsi Zoroastrian priest. From the very beginning he was a pioneer in many fields: he became one of the first Indian graduates of Elphinstone College in Bombay and later became the first Indian professor of that college.

In 1855 he travelled to London to become a partner in Cama & Co, the first Indian company to be established in Britain. Within 3 years, he resigned on ethical grounds and in 1859 set up his own cotton company Naoroji & Co. His London home became a centre for Indian life, attracting students and nationalists, leading to the establishment of some of the earliest South Asian associations, including the London Indian society, the East Indian Association and the London Zoroastrian Association.

He is remembered in India for his leadership of the Indian National Congress a record three times (1886, 1893 and 1906), and his economic critique of British rule in India, 'the drain of wealth theory'. Naoroji's involvement in British politics reached its highest point when, after one failed attempt, he was elected Liberal MP for Finsbury Central in 1892.

His candidature attracted negative publicity when Lord Salisbury, the Conservative Prime Minister, raised the 'race card', questioning the suitability of 'a black man' to stand for parliament

in Britain. The smear tactics seemed to have backfired as Dadabhai Naoroji won the seat, temporarily rallying the Liberal party behind him and most of the press.

Despite his heavy workload and diverse commitments Naoroji was able to juggle running a business, maintaining a family in both India and England and working on a wide variety of political issues (including women's suffrage, opium, temperance and indentured Indian labourers in South Africa), as well as fulfilling his duties as a Liberal MP. Although faced with opposition from within his own party, he remained loyal to the Liberal programme. He lost his seat in 1895.

One of his main concerns was to keep India on the British political agenda. He was a staunch supporter of the principle of self-rule for India or Swaraj. Naoroji left Britain in 1907 and retired to India where he died in 1917 at the age of 92.

The Early Years

Dadabhai Naoroji was born in Bombay on 4th September 1825, the son of Maneckbai and Naoroji Palanji Dordi, a poor Athornan (priestly) Parsi family. At the age of 4, Dadabhai's father died and his mother was left the difficult task of bringing up the family, and she managed admirably. According to prevailing customs, she arranged the marriage of Dadabhai to Gulbai at the early age of 11. For the rest of her life, Maneckbai remained a close companion and mentor to Dadabhai. "She made me what I am" noted Dadabhai in 1901 when he gave an account of his early life in "The Days of my Youth."

Dadabhai became a scholar at the Elphinstone Institution (now Elphinstone College, Bombay) and had a brilliant academic career. In 1850 at the early age of 25, he was appointed Assistant Professor, and 4 years later, Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at the Elphinstone Institution. Professor Orlebar of the college called him "The Promise of India". Dadabhai, being an Athornan (ordained priest), founded the Rahnumae Mazdayasne Sabha (Guides on the Mazdayasne Path) on 1st August 1851. The ethos of the Rahnumae at its inception was to restore the

Zoroastrian religion to its original purity and simplicity. The society is still in operation in Bombay.

Visit to England

On 27th June 1855, Dadabhai sailed for England to join the first Indian business firm of the mercantile Cama family. In 1859, Dadabhai established his own business firm under the name of Dadabhai Naoroji & Co.

The London Anjuman

On 31st October 1861, an association was founded in the name of "THE LONDON ANJUMAN" and Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji was its Patron, Founder and First President.

Other Activities

During his time in England, Dadabhai endeavored to educate the British people about their responsibilities as rulers of India. He delivered speeches and published articles to support his opposition to the unjust and oppressive regime of the British Raj. In 1867 he helped to establish the East India Association of which he became the Honorary Secretary. The purpose of the Association was to keep Britain well informed of India's plight and needs and to secure fair treatment for India's people. This was his first political move and his colleagues were not slow in realizing his aspirations, echoing Professor Orlebar's sentiment as "The Promise of India".

Dadabhai presented to the British people the "Drain Theory", which put before them the facts and figures illustrating systematic bleeding of the wealth and resources of India. His ideas were put into a volume called "Poverty and UnBritish rule in India". This was a charge against the British Empire, and he asked for immediate appointment of a Royal Commission to look into the charges. Dadabhai was one of the members of the Royal Commission.

Dadabhai went back to India in 1869 but soon returned to England to give evidence before the Parliamentary Commission on Indian Finance. Dadabhai returned to India in 1874, having been appointed Dewan of Baroda State. He came back to England

in 1886 with the idea of getting into the British Parliament to enable him to fight from within the system, and further the cause of his native country India.

Election to Parliament

Dadabhai was elected to Parliament on the 5th of July 1892 and entered the House of Commons as a Liberal, representing the Central Finsbury constituency. He delivered his maiden speech in the House of Commons in August 1892. This was indeed a historic occasion as Dadabhai Naoroji became the first ever Indian/ Asian Member of the British Parliament. Dadabhai immediately championed various causes in the House of Commons. He made many speeches both in England and in India on political reforms, fair play and justice for India,which spearheaded the beginning of the freedom struggle. He was renowned as the founding father of Indian Nationalism.

Other Members of Perliament

Dadabhai's success on being elected to the Parliament was followed by two other Indian Parsi Zoroastrians; Sir Muncherjee Merwanji Bhownagree and Sir Sorabji Saklatvala. Dadabhai's reputation and his help facilitated the political careers of both these gentlemen.

Indian National Congress

Dadabhai was one of the moving spirits and founder of the Indian National Congress. He took part in the inauguration of the Indian National Congress that was held in Bombay in 1865, before his departure to England. Dadabhai was thrice elected President of the Congress.

Dadabhai Naoroji had attempted to keep the Freedom movement on a moderate path during the formative years of the Congress. He had put his faith in the British. He believed that if they were informed of India's problems, they would reform their method of rule. However, his experience of the British political system and years of dealing with British officialdom led to increasing disillusionment. Dadabhai began to despair when even

moderate claims were not considered. In 1904 Dadabhai demanded "SWARAJ" Self Government for India. Dadabhai said "Indians were British citizens with a birthright to be free" and that they had "every right to claim an honorable fulfillment of our British pledged rights". -"It is futile to tell me that we must ait till all the people are ready. The British people did not -wait for their parliament". "Self-government is the only and chief remedy. In self-government is our hope, strength and greatness". "I am a Hindu, a Muslim, a Parsi, but above all an Indian First".

On lst September 1888, Gandhi sailed from Bombay with a letter of introduction to Dadabhai. Mahatma Gandhi wrote "...you will, therefore oblige me greatly if you will kindly direct and guide me and make necessary suggestions which shall be received as from a father to his child". Gandhi further wrote: "The story of a life so noble and yet so simple needs no introduction from me or anybody else. May it be an inspiration to the readers even as Dadabhai living was to me". "And so Dadabhai became real DADA to me".

The Grand Old Man

The Grand Old Man of India once asked "Is it vanity that I should take great pleasure in being hailed as the Grand Old Man of India? No, that title, which speaks volumes for the warm, grateful and generous hearts of my countrymen, is to me, whether I deserve it or not, the highest reward of my life".

A great life nobly lived, spanning nearly a whole century, great, indeed in the greatness of its simplicity, purity and benignity and lofty in its concept of man's mission on earth, came to an end on 30th June 1917. Dadabhai passed away at the ripe old age of 93.

Tributes

Sir Narayen Chandravarkar at the "Memorial Meeting" paid a warm affectionate tribute to the life and character of the dear departed sage of India.

"If we take stock of his life and his example, may I not say with perfect justice and truth that in his career, in all he did, in all he suffered and in all he taught, he was the prophet Zoroaster's

religion personified because he was the man more than anybody else of pure thought, of pure speech and pure deeds".

Sir Dinshaw Wacha in a speech full of feeling said: "There is no doubt .. Dadabhai served his country with a sacrifice and singleness of purpose which it may be rightly said, without exaggeration, was rare. A devout follower of Zoroaster, he faithfully followed the ethics of that Great Prophet - pure in thought, word and deed".

Kusoom Vadgama, a prominent writer in London in her recent book "India in Britain" writes: "One whose contributions to Britain by any standards remain memorable and who represented culture, intelligence and public spirit was Dadabhai Naoroji, the first Indian Member of Parliament".

TIMELINE OF DADABHAI NOORJI'S LIFE

1825, September 4

- Dadabhai Naoroji was born in a poor Parsi priest family.
- He lost his father, Naoroji Dordi, when he was four years old.
- His mother Maneckbai took responsibility to educate him, sending him to the Native Education Society school.
- After finishing school he was selected to go to the Elphinstone Institute where his professors were all Englishmen.
- At the Institute he read literature of the world, but Firdausi's Shahnameh was his favorite, and duties of a Zarathushti.
- At age 15, he received Clare's scholarship and was considered a scholar. Professor Orlebar called him "Promise of India"
- At age 20, he became the first Indian professor (of Mathematics & Philosophy) at Elphinstone Institute.
- He was Treasurer of the Student Literary & Scientific society and editor of its proceedings published for the public.

1849, August 4

- He along with other society members laid the foundation of female education in Bombay, by going door to door urging parents to send their girls to school (at that time girls were not allowed to go to school)
- He volunteered to teach free at the first girl's school opened by the Society in a cottage loaned by Jagannath Shankar Sheth, a member of the Board of Education, and with improvements funded by Mr. K.N.Cama
- He started two religious magazines - Dharma Marg Darshak and Rast Goftar to educate Parsis about their religion

1851, August 3

- At age 26, he started a society Rahnumae Mazdayasnane Sabha in cooperation with educationist Naoroji Furdunji, which still exists and has regular meetings.

1855, June 27

- He sailed to London with K.R.Cama and M.H.Cama to join the first Indian business started in England by the Cama family.

1856

- He left the Cama family business and became a Professor of Gujarati, in the University college, London, and worked there for 10 years.

1861

- He founded the London Zoroastrian Association and remained its president until 1907
- He was the first to work systematically for the intellectual uplift of the Indian public. He used every opportunity in England to voice the grievances of the Indian people under colonial rule.

1859

- He started his campaign of agitation about injustice in the system of recruiting for the Indian Civil Service. Sudden change of age limit had debarred the first Indian student, Rustamji Hirjibhai Wadia from appearing for entrance exam.

1886

- He was active in the newly founded "East India Association" to promote the welfare and interest of Indians. He devoted full time to the education of the masses of India on their rights and people of England toward Indians.

1869, July

- A public meeting was called by Maharaja Bhagwat Singhji of Gondal and the Sheriff of Bombay, at the Framji Cowasji Institute, to honor Dadabhai and a purse of Rs.25,000 was presented, most of which he donated to the East India Association Fund.
- He helped the Maharaja, Malharrao Gaekwad, of Baroda in his problems with the British Agent, and pleaded his case in London. In return the Maharaja offered him the post of Diwan (prime minister) of Baroda State.

1875, January 11

- After introducing many reforms as Diwan of Baroda, he resigned and left Baroda on January 11, 1875. The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda has named one of its student hostels as Dadabhai Naoroji Hall (I myself lived in that hostel when I was an Engineering student there).

1875, July 26

- At age 50, he was elected to the Bombay Municipal Corporation. He discovered and reported an error by the Accountant General in calculating principal and interest payable to the Government.

1876, August

- He resigned from the Corporation and went to England for business.

1883

- He was re-elected to the Bombay Municipal Council and worked there until 1886. As an appreciation for his public

services a marble statue of Dadabhai adorns the Corporation Hall.

1885

- He was the moving spirit and Founder of the Indian National Congress, which had its first meeting in 1885, at the Gokuldas Tejpal Pathshala, at Gowalia Tank. This was the institution that started the task of gaining Indian independence.

1886

- He went back to England in 1886, where he contested in the election for the British Parliament but was unsuccessful. He used his visibility to publicize the grievances of the Indian public among the British citizenry.

1886

- At the end of 1886, he was called to attend the second session of the Indian National Congress in Calcutta, where he was elected President. He patched up a conflict between two great leaders, Tilak and Ranade.

  He went back to England after the Congress, and got elected to the British Parliament (first Asian to be elected), in spite of being insulted by the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury who called him "a Black Man". He politely refused to take the oath on the Bible as he was not a Christian, and because of his reputation and moral character he was allowed to take the oath of office in the name of God on his small book of Avesta. He was felicitated by the Maharajas of Baroda, Bhavnagar, and Kutch, Nawab of Junagadh, and prime minister of Hyderabad.

- In Parliamentary debates he charged that gross corruption and oppression by the Europeans had reduced India to a state of abject poverty. His ideas were put into a volume called "POVERTY & UNBRITISH RULE IN INDIA", which was a chargesheet on the British Empire, and he called for immediate constitution of a Royal Commission to look into his charges, which the British did and included him as a member.

His speeches were followed keenly in India, and he was invited as president of the Indian National Congress in Lahore.

- A large crowd received him at Apollo Bunder, and Pherozeshah Mehta drove him to his residence at Khetwadi. Huge crowds and receptions were arranged for him at Baroda and Ahmedabad. In Armritsar, he was presented a robe of honor by the officiating priest of the Golden Temple. In Lahore, the Congress reception committee chairman said to Dadabhai "The greatest gift the Parsis have bestowed on India is in your own good self". He replied "I am a Hindu, a Muslim, a Parsi, but I am an Indian first". William Hunter wrote in the "Times" newspaper that Dadabhai had a welcome greater than the British Viceroy of India.
- The Indians and Englishmen wanted to bestow the title of "Sir" on Dadabhai, but he discouraged the idea. He also politely declined the Shah of Iran's offer to decorate him.
- After finishing his term in the British parliament, he continued his fight for the Indians as a member of the Royal Commission. He got other prominent Indians such as Dinshaw Wachha, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Surendranath Bannerjee, and Subramanian Iyer, to join him on the Commission, and organized a campaign to educate the British public about conditions in India and the demands of Indians. Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi, who was fighting for Indian rights in South Africa, considered Dadabhai as his Guru and constantly sought his advice through letters. In India the appreciative public keenly followed his actions on their behalf and in 1903 they started celebrating September 4th annually, as "Dadabhai Day".

1906

- In 1906, at the age of 80, Dadabhai was invited for a third time to be president of the Indian National Congress in

Calcutta, and he helped to patch up a conflict between the moderates and the extremists. In his keynote speech he demanded "Swaraj" or Self-Rule from the British, which delighted the Congress attendees and the Indian public. He said "Be united, persevere, and achieve self-Government, so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine, and plague may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore among the greatest and civilized nations of the world".

- He returned to England but had an attack of bronchitis. His two grand-daughters, Mrs. Nargis and Gosi Captain attended to him and he recovered.
- In October, he returned to India, where at his house in Versova, Dr. Maneckbhai, his daughter and grand-daughter Dr. Mehrbanoo looked after his health. Foreign dignitaries, such as Sir George Clarke, Lord Hardinge, and Lord Willingdon, regularly visited him.

1916

- At age 91, Bombay University bestowed the honorary degree of L.L.D. on him as well as on Phirozeshah Mehta.

1917, June 30

- Dadabhai Naoroji passed away. After his body was consigned to the Tower of Silence, Sir Narayan Chandavarkar paid the following tribute to him (excerpted):

"If we take stock of his life and his example, may I not say with perfect justice an trust that in his career, in all he did, in all he suffered, and in all he taught, he was the Prophet Zoroaster's religion personified, because he was the man more than anybody else of pure thought, of pure speech and of pure deeds.....

The Sun that rose ninety-three years ago, over India is set, but I say, it is set to rise again in the form of regenerated India, for Dadabhai lived and worked for us with a devotion which must remain for all of us an inspiring example".

THE BENEFITS OF BRITISH RULE, 1871

The Benefits of British Rule for India

In the Cause of Humanity: Abolition of suttee and infanticide. Destruction of Dacoits, Thugs, Pindarees, and other such pests of Indian society. Allowing remarriage of Hindu widows, and charitable aid in time of famine. Glorious work all this, of which any nation may well be proud, and such as has not fallen to the lot of any people in the history of mankind.

In the Cause of Civilization: Education, both male and female. Though yet only partial, an inestimable blessing as far as it has gone, and leading gradually to the destruction of superstition, and many moral and social evils. Resuscitation of India's own noble literature, modified and refined by the enlightenment of the West.

Politically: Peace and order. Freedom of speech and liberty of the press. Higher political knowledge and aspirations. Improvement of government in the native states. Security of life and property. Freedom from oppression caused by the caprice or greed of despotic rulers, and from devastation by war. Equal justice between man and man (sometimes vitiated by partiality to Europeans). Services of highly educated administrators, who have achieved the above-mentioned results.

Materially: Loans for railways and irrigation. Development of a few valuable products, such as indigo, tea, coffee, silk, etc. Increase of exports. Telegraphs.

Generally: A slowly growing desire of late to treat India equitably, and as a country held in trust. Good intentions. No nation on the face of the earth has ever had the opportunity of achieving such a glorious work as this.

I hope in the credit side of the account I have done no injustice, and if I have omitted any item which anyone may think of importance, I shall have the greatest pleasure in inserting it. I appreciate, and so do my countrymen, what England has done for India, and I know that it is only in British hands that her regeneration can be accomplished. Now for the debit side.

The Detriments of British Rule

In the Cause of Humanity: Nothing. Everything, therefore, is in your favor under this heading.

In the Cause of Civilization: As I have said already, there has been a failure to do as much as might have been done, but I put nothing to the debit. Much has been done, though.

Politically: Repeated breach of pledges to give the natives a fair and reasonable share in the higher administration of their own country, which has much shaken confidence in the good faith of the British word. Political aspirations and the legitimate claim to have a reasonable voice in the legislation and the imposition and disbursement of taxes, met to a very slight degree, thus treating the natives of India not as British subjects, in whom representation is a birthright. Consequent on the above, an utter disregard of the feelings and views of the natives. The great moral evil of the drain of wisdom and practical administration, leaving none to guide the rising generation.

Financially: All attention is engrossed in devising new modes of taxation, without any adequate effort to increase the means of the people to pay; and the consequent vexation and oppressiveness of the taxes imposed, imperial and local. Inequitable financial relations between England and India, i.e., the political debt of 100,000,000 clapped on India's shoulders, and all home charges also, though the British Exchequer contributes nearly ,3,000,000 to the expense of the colonies.

Materially: The political drain, up to this time, from India to England, of above 500,000,000, at the lowest computation, in principal alone, which with interest would be some thousands of millions. The further continuation of this drain at the rate, at present, of above 12,000,000 per annum, with a tendency to increase. The consequent continuous impoverishment and exhaustion of the country, except so far as it has been very partially relieved and replenished by the railway and irrigation loans, and the windfall of the consequences of the American war, since 1850. Even with this relief, the material condition of India is such that the great mass of the poor have hardly tuppence a day and a few

rags, or a scanty subsistence. The famines that were in their power to prevent, if they had done their duty, as a good and intelligent government. The policy adopted during the last fifteen years of building railways, irrigation works, etc., is hopeful, has already resulted in much good to your credit, and if persevered in, gratitude and contentment will follow. An increase of exports without adequate compensation; loss of manufacturing industry and skill. Here I end the debit side.

SUMMARY

To sum up the whole, the British rule has been: morally, a great blessing; politically, peace and order on one hand, blunders on the other; materially, impoverishment, relieved as far as the railway and other loans go. The natives call the British system "Sakar ki Churi," the knife of sugar. That is to say, there is no oppression, it is all smooth and sweet, but it is the knife, notwithstanding. I mention this that you should know these feelings. Our great misfortune is that you do not know our wants. When you will know our real wishes, I have not the least doubt that you would do justice. The genius and spirit of the British people is fair play and justice.

6

Nouroji's Inspiration for Struggling

On 27 June 1855 he left for London to join business as a partner in Cama's firm in London. Four years later he started his own firm, having returned to India in the meantime, He travelled back and forth on business between India and England during 1865 to 1876. In 1886 he went to England to contest for election to Parliament and in 1907 to espouse the cause of the freedom on India from British rule.

Foreign travel left its mark on his character and personality. Himself a product of liberal western education, he was an admirer of the western system of education. He sent his daughter abroad for medical education. His son, Adi, was taken to London at the age of 5 and was put to school there. Dadabhai believed that India had cause to be grateful to the British for introducing the western system of education in India and he helped several Indian students who went to England for higher studies.

Books and friends added their contribution to the flowering of his personality. 'Shahnama' of Firdausi, 'Improvement of Mind' by Watt, the works of Carlyle, Mill and Herbert Spencer, to name a few, made a deep impression on him, His constant companion was 'The Duties of the Zoroastrians', which stressed pure thoughts, pure speech and pure deed. His friends among foreigners were innumerable. They started with Professor Orlebar of the Elphinstone College who hailed Dadabhai as the promise of India", and Sir Erskine Perry, the Chief Justice of the Bombay Supreme Court, who was so struck by Dadabahai's academic distinction that he suggested that he should be sent to England. He was

willing to pay half the expenses provided the community was prepared to share the other half. Later, he helped Dadabhai on the Civil Service issue.

Samuel Smith, a leading cotton merchant was impressed by Dadabhai's character and became a close friend and partner in Dadabhai's fight for the freedom of India. Allan Hume, the founder of the Indian National Congress, was another friend. So too were Sir W. Wedderburn Martin Wood, the Editor of the Times of India, who supported Dadabhai's candidature to Parliament, Henry Mayers Hyndmann a British Socialist, Major Evans Bell of the Madras Staff Corps, Sir George Birdwood, Sheriff of Bombay, Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., W.S. Caine and W.A. Chambers. The bond that united them with Dadabhai was love for India and a keen desire to understand her problems.

In India, his friends included Sorabjee Bengali the social reformer, Khursetji Cama, Kaisondas Mulji, K.R. Cama, the Orientalist, Naoroji Furdonji, Jamesdji Tata, and some Indian Princes. Among his younger friends were R.G. Bhandarkar, the Orientalist, N.G. Chandavarkar, the nationalist reformer, Pherozeshah Mehta, G.K. Gokhale, Dinshaw Wacha and M.K. Gandhi. Soon after graduation in 1845, he was appointed as the Native Head Assistant at the Elphinstone Institute, Bombay. In 1850 he became an Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at the Elphinstone College, Bombay. He was the first Indian to be appointed Professor at this College. He taught in the special classes held for the spread of women's education. In March 1856, he was nominated as Professor of Gujarati in the University College, London, a post he continued to hold till 1865-66. During this period Dadabhai took a keen interest in and laboured hard for the spread of education. In 1855-56, he became a business partner and took charge of the London Branch of Cama and Co., and also became a member of the Manchester Cotton supply Association, Further, he took an active part in the deliberation of the Council of Liverpool, the Athenaeum and the National Indian Association.

In 1865 he founded, along with W.C. Bonnerjee, the London India Society and became its President. He continued as President

till 1907, when he returned to India. Thereafter, till his death he remained as its Honorary President'. In 1861 he established the London Zoroastrian Association. In 1862 he separated from Cama and Co., and started his own business in the name of Dadabhai Naoroji & Co. On 1December 1866 he founded the East India Association, London, whose scope for activity was wider, and became its Secretary. In 1974 he was appointed the Dewan of Baroda and a year later, on account of differences with the Maharaja and the Resident, he resigned the Dewanship. In July 1875 he was elected a Member of the Municipal Corporation, Bombay, and in September of the same year, he was elected to the Town Council of the Corporation. In 1876 he resigned and left for London. He was appointed as Justice of the Peace in 1883 and was elected to the Bombay Municipal Corporation for the second time. In August 1885 he joined the Bombay Legislative Council at the invitation of the Governor, Lord Reay.

On 31 January 1885, when the Bombay Presidency Association came into being, he was elected as one of its Vice-Presidents. At the end of the same year, he took a leading part in the founding of the Indian National Congress and became its President thrice, in 1886, 1893 and 1906. During this period, he was engaged in other important activities. In 1873 he gave evidence before the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Finance, the Fawcett Committee, which was appointed through his efforts. Here he sought to prove that the incidence of taxation in India was very high, while the average income of an Indian was barely Rs. 20/-. In 1883 he had started a newspaper called the Voice of India. In 1887 he gave evidence before the Public Service Commission. In 1902 he was elected as a Member of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons, representing Central Finsbury. He was a firm believer in parliamentary democracy and he thought that he should espouse the cause of Indian freedom on the floor of the Commons.

In 1897 he was appointed a Member of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure Kinden known as the Welby Commission. He gave evidence as a witness before this Commission in 1897, and in 1898 he submitted his views in the form of two statements

to the Indian Currency Commission. In 1905 he represented India at the International socialist Congress at Amsterdam. Dadabhai was frequent contributor of articles and papers to various journals and magazines. He wrote regularly for the Students Literary Miscellany, a journal started by the students Literary and Scientific Society at the Elphinstone College, Bombay, which was founded in 1850. He himself edited his society's Gujarati journal the Dnyan Prakash. In 1889, along with a few collaborators, he started the Rast Goftar (Truth Teller), a Gujarati weekly which was known for its advanced and progressive views, and edited it for two years.

In 1883 he started the Voice of India in Bombay and later incorporated it into the Indian Spectator. He contributed articles to newspapers and magazines in England like the Commerce, the India, the Contemporary Reviews,the Daily News, the Manchester Guardian, the Weekly News and Chronicle and the Pearson's Magazine. The Gujarati paper Samachar Darpan published a series of articles by him entitled Dialogues of Socrates and Diogenese.

In 1878 he published a pamphlet, 'Poverty of India', later revised and enlarged in the form of a book published in 1901 from London, under the title 'Poverty and un-British Rule in India. He is known in the history of Indian economic thought for his pioneering work in assessing India's national income, Under the title 'Dadabhai Naoroji's Speeches and Writings', G.A. Natesan & Co., Madras, Published various learned papers which he wrote and read before different societies. Under the title 'The Right of Labour' Dadabhai had formulated and published a scheme for the establishment of Industrial Commissioners' course and for the recognition of labour's right to protection. If passed into law, it would have ensured justice to all wage earners and industrial peace.

He founded the Framji Institute after he left India for London to join business, the Irani Fund, the Parsi Gymnasium, the Widow Remarriage Asociation and the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1851. He founded several important organizations and belonged to many leading societies and institutions, both in India and the U.K.

Some of the important organisations which he helped to found are the Indian National Congress, the East Indian Association London, the Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay and so on.

In personal life Dadabhai was simple, dignified and of a helpful disposition. His letters, which he wrote in his own hand, are revealing and bring out the truth-loving and warm-hearted character that he was. He was a lover of books and he presented his vast library to the Bombay Presidency Association.

He was a leading social reformer of the second half of the nineteenth century. He did not believe in caste restrictions and was a pioneer of women's education and an upholder of equal laws for men and women. Having been a teacher himself of girls, he realized the importance of girl's education. He stressed the importance of primary education.

A keen Zoroastrian, but catholic in outlook, with friends among non-Parsis, like Hume, Wedderburn, Badrudin-Tyabji, Dr. Bhau Daji, K.T.Telang, G.K.Gokhale, he exuded the need for purity in thought, speech and action in his book 'The Duties of the Zoroastrians'. He was a prominent nationalist of progressive views. He prefaced his Calcutta Congress (1906) speech by quoting Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman: Good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves. In the same speech he declared: We do not ask any labour, we want only justice. The whole matter can be compressed in one word, 'Self-Government' or 'Swaraj' like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies. He belonged to the school of moderates, and was a great believer in constitutional methods. He as well-informed about international politics. He contrasted in detail the condition of Ireland with that of India in their financial relations with Britain. He was concerned about the South African issue.

He was a strong critic of British financial administration of India. He complained about the lack of proper distribution of expenditure in the costliest administration of India. To Britain's financial exploitation, he ascribed epidemics like plague, famine, etc, because Government seldom spent an adequate sum to organise preventive measures. In economics, he believed in self-

sufficiency and the importance of cottage industries. He declared: Swadeshi is a forced necessity for India in its unnatural economic muddle. As long as the economic condition remains unnatural and impoverishing. The talk of applying economic laws to the condition remains unnatural and impoverishing.the talk of applying economic laws to the condition on India is adding insult to injury. Although he was a champion of Swadeshi, he was not against the use of machines for organising key industries in the country. He urged Tata to raise Indian capital for his iron and steel plants. Dadabhai was a great public speaker, both in English and in Gujarati. His speeches were remarkable for their simplicity and forcefulness. Known as 'The grand old man of India', Dadabhai Naoroji was a great public figure during 1845-1917. He was in the forefront of the Social Reform Movement. He was indefatigable in his efforts to lift Indian women from their backwardness and channelise the energies of young men who had received the benefits of western education in wholesome directions.

Dadabhai was universally acknowledged to be honest, impartial and fair. When a dispute arose between the Parsi priests of Udwada and Navsari, he was selected to be the sole arbitrator of the dispute.

His forte, however, was Finance. The appointment of the parliamentary committee in 1873 to inquire into Indian Finance was due to his untiring efforts. He was a patriot and a nationalist of a high order. India was constantly in his thoughts. As Dinshaw Wacha said: By universal consent, he has been acclaimed as the Father of Indian Politics and Economics. Through the innumerable societies and organisations with which he was associated and his contributions to organs of public opinion, he voiced the grievances of the Indian people and proclaimed their aims, ideals and aspirations to the world at large. He won with effortless ease high distinction on many fronts and will always be remembered in the history of the national movement.

India's rise over the last two decades has startled some people, mainly because they have not followed developments in India, due to the blindness to India on the part of the Western media,

caused by their increasing interest in mere entertainment on the one hand, and by their unthinking subservience to the perceived power-interests of the West. In spite of that, the fact is that India has risen and is still rising.

Here are Some Facts and Figures

India is, as you know, the largest democracy in the world - some 1.2 billion people - with the largest middle class in the world (up to 350 million people, depending on how one defines the middle class). India as the fourth largest economy in the world, with GDP estimated at US$3.3 trillion. Economic growth has averaged a good 6.5% p.a. in the last 5 years. India is one of the fastest and most stable growing markets worldwide, it is a serious competitor on the world stage in textiles, pharma, bio and IT. In May this year, real estate prices recovered to near their historically highest level, making Mumbai once again one of the most expensive cities in the world. India is the world's largest consumer of gold, the largest producer of sugar, the largest producer & consumer of tea, the second largest producer and user of 2-wheeled vehicles, the second largest producer of cement, and has been, since the 1960s, the largest producer of movies in the world.

It is one of only six countries with the capability to launch satellites, and one of the very few countries in the world with nuclear capability. Even as early as the 1960s, India was the world's largest exporter of nuclear isotopes for medical purposes. India has, outside US, the largest number of pharmaceutical plants approved by the United States Federal Drug Agency. The Indian biotech industry made news by crossing the billion dollar mark, (US$1.068 bn (880 mn Euro) in 2004. But India has made the most waves because it is the biggest destination for outsourced IT development in the world. Actually, India has sophisticated research facilities in every scientific field, rivalling all except the USA and possibly Russia. India has over 3 million scientific and technically-trained people- the 3rd largest such pool of people, after the USA and Russia. There are 3500 science and technology PhDs in India each year. One in every 10 scientists in US is of Indian origin.

We could go on multiplying impressive facts and figures such as these.

But, from these, some important questions arise:

- What has caused this rise?
- Will the rise continue to benefit primarily those who are already rich or will it also benefit substantially those who are poor in India?
- Why did the rise of India not occur earlier?
- Is the rise temporary or will it continue?

In order to answer such questions, it is necessary to have some basic understanding of Indian history, society and politics, beyond the myths that are perpetuated by the American media and the American elite.

So here are some lessons from history. Up to the 18th c, India was one of the largest economies in the world, producing one-third of world output (as did China, by the way, so that together China and India produced something like two-thirds of world output up to the 18th c).

However, this was a matter of relative size even more than of relative productivity.

And this was in spite of the fact that the British had pillaged the Indian economy for more than two hundred years!

In the 19th c, because of the rise of the religious movement known as the Evangelical Revival (the work of Methodists, Baptists and Anglicans, most prominently the Clapham Group), the British were forced to stop *robbing* the Indian economy and instead to start *caring* for it. When I say "forced", I mean precisely that: the Evangelicals had to resort to what became an increasingly contested public campaign, with the world's first signature campaign and increasingly vociferous attacks from their opponents (including death threats), so that there were two defeats in Parliament, before their bill was finally passed on the third attempt. The new legislation was deeply unpopular with the Directors of the East India Company, because, first, it required the Company to invest a certain proportion of its income back into India, in

terms of schools, colleges and universities, hospitals and medical facilities, roads (and seaports and, successively, railways and airports), and so on.

Second, the Company was required to stop the corrupt practice of simply selling jobs to whoever could afford to buy them (resulting in the primary motivation for getting a return on that investment by abusing one's power in order to rob and plunder the country). This practice was stopped, as I say, and the Company was required to hold public examinations, on the basis of which only the best could be recruited for the Company. The Evangelicals also simultaneously set up schools for training students for these exams and launched a recruitment drive in the churches, so that they focused their educational efforts on the brightest and morally best young people they could find. That was why, in the next decade or so, the Company was utterly transformed, from having been "a gang of robbers", into becoming a body of people who became renowned for their intelligence, reliability, honesty, and dedication to serve India.

Most Indian languages were written for the first time by the British, the first dictionaries and grammars of Indian languages were produced by the British, the first newspapers and magazines printed in most Indian languages were produced by the British. For example, Nathaniel Halhed printed the first Bengali grammar in 1778; William Carey produced the Bengali Bible in 1801; the Calcutta School Book Society, whose members were mostly English, released the first series of English-language textbooks in 1817; and the first Indian newspaper in Bengali was started in 1819. The British started examining how to support and improve Indian agriculture, how to codify and systematise complex and contradictory Indian customary laws, they took the fragmented Indian monetary system and tried to create an integrated and sensible economic system for the whole country. This does not mean that there was no abuse of power at all by the British, rather that the overall tenor of the British changed with the adoption of what came to be called "the white man's burden". The outcome was that the British were able to continue to take a reasonable amount of money out of the economy while still leaving the

Indian economy in a better state than it had been earlier. Before the evangelical impact on the East India Company, when it was still a robber, how much exactly did it rob from India?

Well, just as the nineteenth century became the twentieth, Romesh Chander Dutt, an Indian Christian, became the first person to try and provide a proper estimate of this, and his estimate has remained the benchmark for all other studies, though his relative, another Indian Christian, Rajni Palme Dutt, in India Today, Suniti Kumar Ghosh in his book 'India and the Raj 1919-1947, and Dadabhai Nauroji, not to mention Western scholars have provided their own estimates. We could argue, in typical Western academic fashion, about the figures provided by such scholars. But let me go back to Sir Robert Clive's eighteenth century estimate, simply because it was closer to the time and because he had every incentive to minimise the figure, that Bengal alone produced 2 million pounds a year in the money of that time (500 thousand of which was given, because of the treaty, to the local ruler, or Nawab).

That left 1.5 million for the Company to take back to England, from which administrative expenses, naturally, had to be deducted. Even if we agree a sum of only £1 million a year for the Company, on average, then, over some 350 years, working in very rough numbers, Bengal alone produced something like 350Million£ for the British. Of course, the value of that money varied over time, but we could calculate that, in today's money, to be something of the order of at least few Trillion pounds (in today's prices, a British pound will buy you something like 1.5 dollars, and you may want to keep in mind that the budget discussions now going on in your Parliament you are talking about a US Government budget of only some 33 billion $. Do note that the trillions of £ that Clive enabled the British to take out of India, was revenue produced by only one Indian kingdom (though the richest one): there were some 500 kingdoms in what is today's India!

If the first phase in the British engagement with India was simply to rob it, from roughly 1600 to roughly 1820, and the second phase from 1820 to 1900 consisted in caring for it, the 3rd phase, till 1947, was marked by a sort of "running on empty"

syndrome: the moral imperatives of the Evangelicals were successfully undermined, at least for that time, by the efforts of the British elite to use Darwinism (evolution, remember, was an Indian and Greek idea long before Darwin) as the battering ram for godlessness and for breaking the bonds of Christian morality. So an increasing number of British officers in India arrived without any real relationship with Jesus, without any particular desire to serve India, and found themselves in the context of a strong tradition of service to India because of the legacy of evangelicalism, which most of them continued but without the commitment and passion of the evangelicals, and with an increasing number departing from that tradition but with nothing worthwhile to put in its place. The dilemma of the British in India in this phase is well captured by EM Forster's novel, Passage to India. After the British lost a huge number of men in the two World Wars, there were not enough men left to run the Empire, and the end of Empire was only a question of time.

The Evangelicals had been clear that, by establishing the English-language system of education in India, they were laying the foundations for India's independence, because English-language education infused Indian thinking with Western and Christian concepts such as linear time (instead of the Indian cyclical time), the importance of this world (as distinct from the importance of the next world), nationalism, equality, intellectual freedom, freedom of association, social concern and universalistic ethics - which are what distinguish modern India from traditional India, and enable modern India to compete in the world economy today. Recently, Amartya Sen has argued in his new book, The Argumentative Indian, that democratic ideas also obtained in India (and by the way in other traditional societies such as Greece and indeed tribal societies around the world). However, the first society in history that was able to actually practice democracy beyond the bounds of one tribe or city was Protestant Europe.

Moreover, it was because the British moved from robbing India to caring for India that, at the time that the British left, India still had one of the largest economies in the world. In fact, in terms of industrial output, India was the 8th in the world. Agriculture

was in a reasonable state, and the overall health of the economy was not bad. The main contributions by the British to India can be summarised as morality and ethics, the commitment to the rule of the law, which eventually produced the kind of Constitution we have today, roads and ports and other infrastructural projects, hospitals and care for the weak and oppressed, schools and, perhaps most important from the perspective of our subject today, English-language education.

When India became independent of the British, every Indian naturally thought that, now that the British were no longer taking money out of the Indian economy, India would grow much faster.

But what actually happened? Let us remind ourselves that even in the eighteenth century, after some two hundred years of British rule and misrule, India still shared with China the distinction of being one of the world leaders in terms of economic wealth. Some 150 years of further rule by the British reduced India at the time of Independence to only number 10 or so (depending on the figures one uses). But only some 55 years of self-rule and misrule by Indians has reduced India to something like 100th in the world in the Human Development Index.

Following independence, we had outstanding progress only in the 1st five year plan period, when India focused on transforming the rural sector, increasing greatly its investment in agriculture, education, hospitals, and so on. Starting with the 2nd Five-Year Plan, however, India decided to follow the Leninist strategy of taking resources from the agricultural sector in order to invest in the industrial sector.

The whole economy became both highly regulated and state-directed as well as more and more corrupt (particularly after India's first Prime Minister, Mr Nehru, decided to tolerate corruption in two of his cabinet ministers even after documents had been published in one of the leading Indian magazines conclusively proving that they had taken enormous bribes). Corruption therefore grew and grew in the country, slowly at first and then faster and faster, till it became a stranglehold. I recollect an incident from my college days, where a stranger stopped his

car, in response to my thumb being out, to offer some of us a lift from the university campus to the centre of New Delhi. As we made polite conversation, we discovered that he was a professor at the Delhi School of Economics. I asked him whether it was really the case that DSE was as good, intellectually, as the famous London School of Economics. He laughed and said, yes, in some areas it is even better! "Sir, so why is it that we make so little progress as a country?", I asked. He thought for a moment then said, "Well, we can make our 5-year plans, which are world class, but, you know corruption destroys much of the good that we do. How can mere plans cope with corruption?".

Well, corruption is still a key problem in the country. At the 2000 India Economic Summit sponsored by the World Economic Forum and the Confederation of Indian Industry, Gilbert Etiennne, Professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, referred to corruption as the most dangerous issue responsible for decelerating growth in South Asia. He pointed out, for example, that 40 to 50% of India's total power output, estimated to be worth around US$ 1.2 billion, is stolen by our people. BTW, India must be the only country in the world where, if you want to pay your electricity bill, that also produces a request for a bribe! At the same conference, Mr. N. Vittal, Chief Vigilance Commissioner, India, argued that India's weak judiciary is also partly responsible for aggravating corruption. He pointed out that the average disposal time for a case is 20 years and the conviction rate is only 6%. And what percentage of the convicted really spend the appropriate amount of time in prison has never been properly calculated, to my knowledge.

It was and is not only corruption that slows down progress. It was the entire system of controls and licences which stifled initiative and constricted the possibility of progress, specially as it built on the traditional Indian caste-system which enabled the top 3 castes (including my own business caste) to exploit the resources of the country to our benefit but kept the majority of our people backward. This means that something like 80% of India's human resources have been under-utilised through history. and still continue to be under-utilised. As the world has moved

into a knowledge-work economy, the key question for India is whether and how fast India can succeed in liberating its people from the thrall of the top 3 castes and their hangers-on. Though in theory India abolished caste-discrimination at Independence, in practice caste is still surprisingly strong in the rural areas of India, where the majority of our people still live.

In any case, as a result of the combination of caste, the centralised system of removing resources from our agricultural sector in order to build our industrial sector, and the corruption associated with both caste and planning, India's growth rate returned, from the Second Five-Year Plan period, to the traditional "Hindu rate of growth" of 3 to 3.5% …at the same time as the then so-called "Tiger economies" of East Asia took off in terms of growth.

This forced Indians gradually to realise that we needed to change our ways, and it was only when India began to borrow from the international community (from the World Bank and the IMF and so on) in the 80s that the rate of growth began to rise, though at the cost of greater vulnerability to external conditions - with the consequent balance of payments crisis in the 90s. That, in turn, persuaded the Indian elite to think finally of liberalising the economy from the 90s. Though it must be said that there is little evidence that liberalisation by itself produces growth, and there is plenty of evidence that it is the rate of investment in production, in infrastructure and in human resources that produces growth. Foreign capital can certainly facilitate that, though it would be much better if it could be done with domestic capital. It is worth noting that widespread corruption has created a black economy that is now at least equal to the white economy in India. Most black money, since it cannot be legally spent in India, either travels abroad by formal or informal means, or ends up in conspicuous consumption, which is a boon for Western and Indian companies selling luxury goods, but does not help the Indian economy as much as it would if it was properly invested.

Since the 1980s, Indian governments, of various political hues, have managed well the delicate balance between the need to keep

foreign investors happy (by repaying the interest on loans, and dividends on investments, but also by the associated liberalizations) and to encourage domestic investment. This game has produced somewhat slower growth in India than in China which has built itself up by aggressively courting and inviting in foreign capital and technology. But the Indian advantage has been that India is less exposed to foreign conditions (when the stock market collapse of Spring 2000 happened, the Indian economy was hardly affected, and the doldrums in the global economy since then have not had much impact on growth in India either).

However, I am going too fast. We must look at one other important foundation-stone for the rise of India that was laid even before independence - i.e. Nehru's grand vision for the building of our nation. He it was who encouraged the top Indian scientists and technologists and patronised them, since science, technology and heavy industry were for him a symbol of development and progress, as they were in the Soviet Union). For example, there is the story, documented in Nehru's correspondence, of his having promised to one of our top scientists that, if he would come back to India, he (Nehru) would never question how much money he needed or for what he needed it - a promise that Nehru kept, according to the archives of the Planning Commission, the one item that was never even discussed, let alone questioned, was the budget for scientific research and development.

So what has all this to do with ideology and religion?

1. Firstly, throughout history, India's utilization of the vast majority of its human potential has been held back by the caste system and by our dominant religious attitude of the greater importance of tradition and the next world, than material progress in this world.
2. Secondly, the caste system began to be broken up by new religious movements (Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, and so on, and the rise of "Christianised Hindu movements" such as Arya Samaj and Swami Vivekananda and Swaminarayan and Gandhiji). However, the most effective breaker-up of caste was not preaching or the establishment of new religious groups (which were ineluctably ghettoised by Brahminism). Rather, the break-up of caste structures happened most effectively as a by-product of the starting of new British "factories" and cities where caste did not and could not play a role. Why did these factories and cities not get ghettoised as the non-caste communities of Christians and Muslims and Sikhs and so on had been ghettoised earlier? Because the factories and cities were focused on the new religion of money and material advancement, and were not about yet another religion which offered only pie in the sky when you die, but very real rewards here on this earth. Predictably, the upper castes first opposed the new factories and cities, then wanted to capture the new institutions (as still happens! For example, it is notorious that the membership of Rotary and other Service Clubs in Delhi is along caste lines!).
3. Thirdly, the ideology of nationalism was what began to create contemporary India (nationalism is a foreign import - before English-language education brought it to us, via the Reformation and the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, we had loyalty only to kings, queens or to in-groups).
4. Fourth, the variety of Socialism favoured by Nehru, with its fascination with science and technology and large industrial projects, laid the foundations for the rise of India in the knowledge-industries.
5. Fifth, Capitalism (which is also an ideology) led to the borrowing of foreign capital and to the liberalisation of regulations, and therefore the opening of India to exploitation not only by its own national elite (consisting of the top three castes with a few other individuals/families who were co-opted, particularly via the activism of Mahatma Gandhi and the meritocracy of the Administrative Services) but liberalisation led also to exploitation by the global elite. The only advantage is that the global elite has already been influenced by Christian ethics, and will probably be influenced even more in the future by it.

6. Sixth, the creative and knowledge industries in India (Bollywood, IT, scientific research), in theory, do not discriminate on the basis of caste. However, in practice, the bulk of Indian knowledge-workers still come from the top castes, though caste is slowly losing its hold, specially in the metropolises. Caste is present less and less even in questions of marriage. The Indian film industry, which was initially dominated by Muslims, has historically played a big part in reducing the hold of caste, though in the last ten years or so, the film industry seems to have reduced its commitment to secularism and has started promoting Hinduism again.
7. Seventh, the revivalist "fascist Hindu" movements have developed quite a following, and threaten not only to undo all the progress achieved so far (for example, they would like to bring back the practice of burning widows on the funeral pyre of their husbands) but also to undo the nation state (India is the 2ND OR 3rd largest Muslim country in the world) by their view of majoritarianism which they see as being superior to the rule of law. All of India's contemporary problems go back to the tension between, on the one hand, a basic understanding of a nation as a conglomeration of people's with their own beliefs and practices, with a commitment to a free markets in ideas, beliefs, religions and ideologies and, on the other hand, and what we might call "Hinduistic nationalism" which confuses majority opinion with the rule of law.

Ladies and gentlemen, I began this lecture by raising four questions:

- What has caused this rise?
- Will the rise continue to benefit primarily those who are already rich or will it also benefit substantially those who are poor in India?
- Why did the rise of India not occur earlier?
- Is the rise temporary or will it continue?

Well, you now have, I hope, my answers to the first three questions, whether or not you agree with them. And you may not agree with my answer to the fourth question either, but here it is: India's rise will continue, provided the fascist Hindu parties are kept in check, economic liberalisation continued and, most importantly, investment in education and in infrastructure is ramped up to an adequate level.

Indeed, as far as I can see, India's rise will continue well after China has collapsed, and India's growth will continue till the key issues facing the global economy and polity are addressed. If these issues are addressed, India will have its share of the benefits. And what if these issues of global economics and politics are not addressed? Well, we will see within the next ten years or so, robotics combined with gene-technology and nano-technology, beginning to bring history to a close.

These are of course much broader issues. Therefore, let me conclude by coming back to the overall topic.

Briefly, it is impossible to understand any aspect of India, historical or contemporary, if one systematically ignores or underplays religion and ideology, as many Western and Indian scholars (particularly in the fields of history and of business, though even in psychology) have tried, and still try, to do. Still worse is it, when theoreticians pretend that they are unbiased or neutral in terms of ultimate beliefs.

Religion has played a key part in holding India back from progress over thousands of years of history, and religions as well as ideologies have played a key part in helping to break the hold of India's religious system, and indeed in laying the foundations of all the progress that the country has made recently.

It is not possible to understand and support India's growth if one follows the Hindu fundamentalist or fascist path chosen by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the Bharatiya Janata Party, and their associated bodies. India's continued rise is dependent on maintaining and improving the rule of law, the Constitution, effective implementation of decisions, information transparency, the campaign against corruption and against discrimination on

the basis of caste and religion, and national commitment to rapid and effective investment in India's infrastructure, education and productive capacity.

HISTORY OF THE GHADAR MOVEMENT

"The word Ghadar means mutiny...it is aimed at bringing about a revolution in India in order to secure liberation from British Control. The headquarters of the Ghadar Party were established in San Francisco and the Party published their own paper known as the Ghadar, and founded an institution known as the Yugantar Ashram, the object of the institution being to instill patriotic feelings in young Indians and train them for a rising in India."

> *"The Ghadar, or Mutiny, conspiracy derived its origin from the Pacific Coast of America, its centre being at San Francisco...the object of the paper (Ghadar) was to bring about a rising in India within few years because the people could no longer bear the oppression and tyranny practiced under English rule. It was stated that the Yugantar Ashram had been founded in San Francisco, and that in this institution books would be compiled, young preachers trained, and preparations for a rising would be taken in hand. The paper amply fulfilled the worst anticipations that could have been formed from such an introduction. It was violently anti-British in nature, playing on every passion that it could possibly excite...and urging all Indians to go to India with the express intention of committing murder, causing revolution and expelling the British Government by any means."*
> *- Account of Ghadr Conspiracy*

Punjab Police, Lahore 1919

> *"...That these defendants in the year 1914, about the beginning of the European war, entered into a conspiracy the object of which was to produce mutiny and rebellion and the overthrow of the British Government in India...that in order to produce this rebellion and mutiny in India, these defendants did certain things in the United States of America... that these defendants conspired to recruit men in America, to give them training in*

> *the use of arms and explosives in America, to dispatch them to India to places on the border line of the Indian territory, there to be assembled and trained further by officers in part at least sent from America; that likewise in this country funds were provided,...that men were to be dispatched from here to carry these funds that were to be expanded in other places than America; that these men were to go themselves, some of them, and engage in this rebellion; that arms and ammunitions were to be purchased and shipped from our shores and from our borders; that passage was to be engaged in large numbers for returning persons desiring to enter into this military enterprise."*
> *- Prosecution of Gadharites in the US*

San Francisco 1917

(The British government spent $2.5 million on this trial, an enormous sum indicating the degree to which the Empire feared this movement.)

The Ghadar Movement was a movement of patriotic, progressive, democratic, and enlightened Indians living abroad, working for the emancipation of India from the yoke of British colonialism and the birth of a new India based on national and social emancipation. They organized themselves in 1913 among communities throughout the world, adopting the following goals and means:

1. To liberate India with the force of arms from British servitude and to establish a free and independent India with equal rights for all.
2. To establish their headquarters in San Francisco, that would serve as a base to coordinate all the activities for achieving these aims and objectives.
3. To publish a weekly paper, Ghadar, in Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi and in other languages of India.
4. To hold organisational elections every year to elect a coordination committee from the different committees to carry out all the work.

5. To organize cells amongst Indian railway, industrial, and farm workers, as well as students who would be directly linked to the centre.
6. The coordination committee would elect a three-member commission to supervise the political and underground work.
7. Revenue would be drawn from each member through a monthly contribution of one dollar.
8. No discussion or debate was to take place on religion within the organization. Religion was considered a personal matter and that it had no place in the organization.
9. Every member was duty bound to participate in the liberation struggle of that country in which they were resident.

At the initial gathering in Astoria in 1913, Sohan Singh Bhakna was elected President, Kesar Singh Thathgarh, Vice President, Lala Hardayal, General Secretary, Lala Thakur Das Dhuri, Joint Secretary, and Pandit Kanshi Ram Mardauli, Treasurer.

In a conference held in Sacramento, California in December 1913, new members were included in the executive committee: Santokh Singh, Kartar Singh Sarabha, Arur Singh, Pirthi Singh, Pandit Jagat Ram, Karm Singh Cheema, Nidhan Singh Chugha, Sant Vasakha Singh, Pandit Munshi Ram, Harnam Singh Kotla, Nodh Singh. To carry out the secret and underground work of the party, a three-member commission was also constituted by Sohan Singh Bhakhna, Santokh Singh and Pandit Kanshi Ram.

Publication of Ghadar also began after this conference. On its masthead the paper had inscribed in bold letters - Enemy of the British Rule in India. It included articles on the conditions of the people of India under British hegemony, and it also dealt with the problems that confronted Indians abroad such as racial attacks and discrimination. It called upon the Indian people to unite and rise up against British rule and throw the British out of India. Ghadar was published in Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi and in other languages of India. Besides Ghadar, the Yugantar Ashram, the

headquarters of the Ghadar Party, also brought out various publications to raise the consciousness of the people and organize them to revolt against the British. A poster entitled, "Jang Da Hoka" (Declaration of War), which was distributed widely, read as following:

Clarion Call for the Ghadar Army

The British have occupied our dear land. Our commerce and industry has been ruined. They have plundered and looted the wealth of Hindustan and brought famine and plague. More than 90 million Hindustanis do not even have one square meal a day. Thirty million have died due to famine and plague. They are sending all our produce and grains to England. It is due to these conditions of misery that Hindustanis have started going to far off lands such as Australia, Canada, America, and Africa and when they have begun to fill their stomachs, it has poked needles and pins in the heart of the British. Because it has opened the eyes of the Hindustanis and they are understanding all the schemes of the British, these British strangle us in India. And when we come abroad here they also make our lives miserable. They have closed Australia and Canada for us. Our mothers, sisters and children are treated like animals in Africa by the British.

Now the British are pressuring the American government to stop us from coming to the shores of America. The American government has said that if the British government is stopping the Hindus from coming to their own-ruled countries, Australia and Canada, why should we allow them to come here. This bill is in their parliament (Congress). If this bill is passed we will be ruined. Other countries will also make such laws. Now is the time to do something about this condition.

Brave Hindis! Awaken from your sleep. The British are getting you thrown out from everywhere. Let us unite and fight so such laws are not passed here. We should also think about, whether or not these laws pass, what should we do? What is our duty at this time? Our duty at this time is to prepare an army to fight against British rule in India which is the root of all our problems. This is not the time for talk. This is the time for war. How long

will you wait? How long will the world keep calling you slaves? On Sunday, February 15, a huge gathering will take place in Stockton. All Hindus and Muslims of America are called upon to join. No more petition to the oppressors. Now we have to take our rights with sword. AN ARMY WILL BE RECRUITED FOR THE GHADAR IN INDIA.

Come brothers, you have earned plenty of dollars! Take the ship back to our motherland! Come let us go back to our motherland and raise the banner of revolt! Come to the gathering in Stockton and take a vow to go back to Hindustan and fight in the Ghadar! Just as this call is written in blood in the same fashion the letter of freedom will be written in ours and the blood of the British on the soil of Hindustan. For this oath, this call is being sent out from the Yugantar Ashram. This is not a paper, but a declaration of war! Stop everything and come! Do not delay! ONLY HE IS A BRAVE FIGHTER WHO FIGHTS FOR HIS COUNTRY. EVEN IF HE IS CUT INTO PIECES, HE DOES NOT LEAVE THE BATTLEFIELD. _______________

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF INDIA

Dear Friends,

We do not have to remind you; you all know how much we have suffered under the British rule. We all wish to get rid of this foreign tyrant who has been bleeding us white. The time is coming when our united efforts will be able to throw off the yoke of this aggressor.

Another world war is approaching. We must take advantage of this opportunity. England is sure to get involved in the coming war. Political wisdom demands that we must utilize this rare opportunity for our good. We must put forward our demand for complete independence when our enemy, British imperialism, is engaged in a life and death struggle. To save her life, Britain will need India's friendship more than anything else. We must demand complete independence as the price of our friendship.

We must let the British rulers know in clear terms right that if they care for the friendship of India, they must be prepared to give India full independence at once. Otherwise India will resist

to limit their effort to get any help from India. It is beside the point how we will resist, but resist we will.

Complete independence means India's control over treasury, foreign affairs, and military forces. Nothing short of that will do.

We must remember that we can no longer trust any more promises from the British imperialists. To our sorrow, we have found out many times that we can not rely upon their words. We must stand pat on our demands; we must one way or another unite until our demands are met.

The world situation is such that the British will think twice before refusing India's demand. We must not miss this golden opportunity.

To get full advantage of the situation, we must put up a strong united front. All those Hindustanis who really work for independence must come together in a united front. Personal differences must be forgotten. Unity of purpose is essential for our cause. All of us who hold India's freedom dear to us, must work to establish a formidable united front. Our demands backed by our united front will have a telling effect.

Our demands must be popularized among our countrymen. Our people must be made to act in case our demands are not met.

Now is the time to educate our people: tomorrow may be too late. During the war, martial law will make things difficult. Unless the masses are made ready to act, our demands will not have much weight. The British imperialists care little for empty resolutions unless they are backed by united might of the masses.

War may start any day. We have not a moment to lose. We must do our best to educate and organize the Indian masses while we have time. Our slogans must be such as:

Complete Independence or Non-cooperation! Freedom or Nothing Else! No Freedom, No Soldiers from India! No Freedom, No Money from India! Freedom or Resistance!

Yours for the cause

Soldiers of Independence _______________

FACTS AND FIGURES - THE BALANCE SHEET

(Bilan, Complete Rendu, Translated from the Hindustan Ghadar)

SOME MAIN ITEMS

(1) Englishmen drain from India and take to England every year 50 crore rupees ($167 million); consequently the Hindus have become so poor that the daily average income per capita is only 5 paise (2.5 cents).

(2) The land tax is more than 65% of the net produce.

(3) The expenditure on the education of 240 million persons is about 0.02 percent per head per annum,

about $40,000,000

on sanitation $6,000,000

but on the army $330,000,000

(4) Under the British rule, the famines are ever on the increase and in the last ten years 20 million men, women, and children have died of starvation.

(5) From the plagues that have occurred, during the sixteen years past, 8 million deaths have resulted. And the death rate during the last thirty years has steadily increased from 24 per mile to 34 per mile.

(6) Means are employed to spread disunion and disorder in the native states and to increase British influence there.

(7) Englishmen are not punished for murdering Hindus or for insulting Hindu women.

(8) With money taken form the Hindus, aid is given to English Christian priests.

(9) Attempt is always made to create enmity between people of different religious denominations.

(10) The arts and crafts (Industries) of India have been destroyed for England's benefit.

(11) Employing India's money, and sacrificing the lives of the Hindus as soldiers, China, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt and Persia have been conquered.

(12) For the sake of the almighty dollar, the British government has forced poppy cultivation in India, thereby creating the drug menace for India and the world.

The Ghadarites wanted to establish a Democratic Republic of India in which all peoples, irrespective of their race, religion, gender, language, or national origin, would have equal rights. They envisioned a United States of India as a federation of all the nations, nationalities and tribal people of Hindustan.

This was illustrated by the poster of United States of India issued by the Ghadar Party (see illustration). According to Bhagat Singh Bilga one of the few Ghadarites still alive, Ghadarites were influenced by the First War of India's Independence of 1857 (the oiriginal Great Ghadar), and the American, French, and Bolshevik Revolutions. They wanted a completely independent, secular, and democratic India in which there would be no exploitation of man by man.

A precursor of Ghadar, The Talvar, which was printed in Berlin, had on its front page in a April-May 1910 issue a couplet from Bhadur Shah Zafar, one of the leaders of the Ghadar of 1857, and the lead article was dedicated to May 10, 1857, the date of the uprising. The article concludes:

In memory of

Rani Lakshmi Bai and her comrades

Mandar and Kashi

Rana Kunwar Singh

Maulvi Ahmad Shah

Tantia Tope

Kuar Khuda Baksh

Ghulam Ghose Khan

Mangal Pandey

and of those tens of thousand men and women who perished in 1857 in the sacred attempt to wrench the mother from the hands of the Faranghi.

A March 19,1917 issue of Ghadar proclaimed in bold letters "RUSSIA HAS BECOME FREE, SOON INDIA WILL BE FREE", following the fall of the Czarist regime in Russia and the beginning of the revolution there.

In their publications, the Ghadarites dealt with the problems and issues of the day. In Nia Zamana, they urged all Indians to unite and fight for a new India and spare no sacrifice for the freedom of their land and work tirelessly for liberty and the rights of all. They also engaged in polemics against various organisations and tendencies that they regarded as diversions from the most important task at hand, namely revolution:

It is the duty of all to use every endeavor to improve the condition of India, but it is also necessary to act intelligently...there are several wrong movements in the country which are of no value upon which money, time and moral power are being wasted. The founders of these movements are fools or selfish men, who hope to obtain a reward from Government by misleading the young men of the country...The following are some of the movements:

The Congress: All wise men know that the Congress is an official assembly. The founder of this assembly of ignorant persons was an Englishman named Mr. Hume. Almost every year an Englishman is appointed as its president. Mr. Gokhale, who takes a great part in it, is a titled man and member of the Imperial Legislative Council. Messrs. Mehta and Nauroji are also titled men...In short, all its members are flatterers and timid men. They do not think of measures for the prevention of famine and plague. They have learnt certain sentences which they repeat every year...They beg government to give them their rights merely by begging...These empty shows can not result in preventing famines, reducing taxes, spreading industry, introducing administration of real justice, filling the stomachs of cultivators and removing plague. The appointment of a few young men to Legislative councils can not result in any good to the country, even though they may be able to deliver very eloquent speeches. The acceptance of government service by able Indians only causes great harm to the

nation...This is not the way to free country from the calamities which are devastating it...great courage and wisdom are required to awaken the country. The flattery of Englishmen can be of no avail...Congress is in the hands of Englishmen and conducted by them from London...Avoid it...

Religious Movements--Several new creeds and religious associations are coming into existence in India, everyone of which boasts of liberating India from Slavery...Religious disputes among different sections are considered by some as signs of the activity and energy of the Hindu nation...They think that when there is one religion throughout India no foreign nation can aspire to become her ruler. But this is not borne out by history and is opposed to common sense. Every person can have his/her own philosophical or religious principles. Nobody should be compelled to act upon a particular principle and thought...Social organisations should not be based upon religion...India has produced patriots like Ram Singh, Nana Sahib, Tantia, The Rani of Jhansi, Mr. Tilak, Amba Prasad Sufi, and Ajit Singh, but the religion of these men was not the same. So it is not necessary that there should be one religion throughout the country...It is foolish to think that a single religious association would be sufficient for all purposes. Education and social reform should not be based on religion...The prosperity and happiness of a people does not depend on a particular creed...To abandon efforts for liberty and equality and to devote one's entire zeal to religion is to degrade one's self below the status of man. Duty, knowledge and happiness depend on liberty and equality and upon these also depends the deliverance of a country, and in fact of the whole world.

Hindu Sabha--An association called by this name exists in Northern India. Its business is to celebrate certain festivals and to send congratulatory messages to the Lieutenant Governor. The members of this society are rich and titled sycophants...As the supporters of this movement are mostly flatterers and sycophants who have no idea of liberty it can not be conducive to any good to the country.

Temperance--This movement is also unnecessary, for a very low percentage of Hindus drink liquor. It is a foolish movement,

for drink is not ruining India. It is not the cause of famine or plague. It does not rob people of their money, nor is it the cause of injustice being done to them. If you really want to do some work, you should work against the British Government: otherwise do not make useless noise.

Protection of Cows--This also is a useless movement, for the Hindus do not kill cows and they have no control over the Muhammadans or the Christians who do so...To obtain liberty should be the first aim of every person and one must have a greater regard for the rights and interests of human beings than for those of the cow...

Education--When the Hindus have nothing else to do they turn their attention to establishing colleges and universities...True education can not be imparted in any country before it has acquired liberty, for in such country all schools of the people possess no rights, their education will be wholly under the control of the government...

Social Reforms--Some Hindus lay great stress upon such minor matters as the age of marriage, the re-marriage of widows, the raising of the depressed classes and so on. These reforms are good but do not limit great movements to these objects...It is not due to any social custom that 75 Lakhs of men have died and that plague and famine visit the country so frequently...Try to include liberty and equality in the politics of your country and then you will find true knowledge and happiness everywhere...

Spread of Hindi Language--The Urdu-Hindi controversy misleads many lovers of the nation. As regards such movements it should be remembered that the proper time for them will be when we have obtained our goal...It is childish to ask government to introduce Hindi in courts or to have Hindi inscriptions on coins and currency notes. Do you consider government courts permanent that we ask government to introduce Hindi there?...whilst there is so much clamour against Urdu, why is there none against English, which is a foreign language?"

The Ghadarites saw social and national emancipation of the peoples of India as the most decisive condition for a prosperous

and happy life. Therefore they concentrated all their efforts and energies and urged all the peoples of Hindustan to do so irrespective of their creed, colour, language, or caste. They wanted dignity and honour for all in and outside of Hindustan, and the necessary condition for this was the liberation of India from the rule of the British and their collaborators. To liberate India from the shackles they called upon all the Indians to return to India and overthrow the British rule.

Through the pages of Ghadar Di Goonj they spread their message in poetic form. Ghadar Di Goonj was published in Shahmukhi and Gurmukhi. This poetry was hard hitting and simple:

Kuli Kuli Pukarda Jag Saanun
Saada Jhulda Kitey Nishan Kiyon Nahin
Kikoon Bachangey Sada Ghulam Rahkey
Saanun Rajniti Wala Giyan Kiyon Nahin
Dhayi Totru Kha Gaye Khet Sada
Hindustan da Koi Kisan Kiyon Nahin

(We are called coolies in countries abroad
We do not have a flag of our own
Will we always live the life of slaves?
Why do we not know the science of politics?
A handful people have taken control of our land
Why is not there a caretaker of Hindustan?)

Marna Bhala Ghulami di Zindagi Ton
Nahin Sukhan eh Man Bhulaavney Da
Mulk Jaagyaya Cheen Jo Ghook Suta
Dhol Vajyaya Hind Jagaawanney Da
Saanun Lord Na Panditan Kazian Di
Nahin Shok Hai Berda Dubavaney Da
Jap Jaap Da Waqt Bateet Hoya
Vella Aa Giya Teg Uthavney Da

Pardhkey Ghadr Akhbar Nun Khabar Lagi
Vela Aa Giya Ghadr Machavaney Da

(It is better to die than live a life of servitude
We should never forget this saying
China has awakened from its sleep
Battle drums of Hindustan's awakening are raging
We do not need Pandits or Kazis
As we do not want our ship to sink
The time for prayers and Puja is past
This is the time to pick up the sword
The Ghadar paper is proclaiming
That the time for revolt is here)

It also stated which organisational steps people must take:

Khufiya Raj Societiyan Karo Kaayam
Rall Marhatey Bengali De Yaar Ho Jayo
Hindu Sikh Te Momno Karo Jaldi
Ik Dusrey De Madadgar Ho Jayo

(Establish secret political organizations
Bengalis and Marathis all should get together
Hindu, Sikh and Muslims all should unite
And stand together with each other)

Ghar Ghar Gupti Sabha Banayo
Logan Ko Mantar Sikhlayo
Har Aik Dil Main Jot Jagayo
Binan Joot Yeh Bhoot Na Jaayi
Jaldi Ghadar Macha Diyo Bhai

(Form secret societies in every household
Arouse the people with the Mantra of freedom
Start the spark in every heart

Without force the scourge of British colonialism will not leave
Hurry to the call of revolution)

They described the conditions of Hindustan:

Bhukhey Marnn Bacchey Kaall Vich Sadey
Khatti Khann Saadi Englistan Walley
Kannak Beejkey Khann Nun Jaun Mildey
Paisa Chhadadey Nahin Laggan Valley
Laayiya Tax Firangiyan Bahut Yaaro
Bhukhey Marann Gharib Dukaan Valley
Karo Paltan Nun Khabardar Jaakey
Sutey Payey Kiyon Teg Chalaan Valley
Musalmaan Pathan Balwan Dogar
Singh Soormey Yudh Machaann Valley
Hindustaniyan Morchey Fatey Keetey
Burma, Misar Te Cheen Sudan Valley

(Our children are dying in famines
The English are enjoying the fruit or our toil
We sow wheat but we get barley to eat
We are not left with a penny, all is taken by the tax collectors
The English have levied heavy taxes
Poor shopkeepers are dying of hunger
Go and arouse the army
Why those who wield the sword are asleep?
Brave Muslims, Pathans and Dogras
Valiant Sikhs in the battlefield
Hindustanis fighting on fronts in
Burma, China, Egypt and Sudan)

They exposed the so-called leaders of the Hindustanis, the collaborators of the British:

Jattan Sidhiyan Nun Koi Dosh Nahin

Sadey Leaderan Da Manda Haal Singho

Rai Bandran Mulk Veeran Kita

Piyar Rakhdey Bandran Nal Singho

Sanun Paas Angrez De Bechaya Hai

Aap Mulk De Banney Dalal Singho

(The common folk is not to be blamed

Our 'leaders' are traitors

Rai Bhadurs, copy cats of the British, have ruined our land

They have sold us to the British

And have become pimps of the British)

They called upon the people of Hindustan to see through the illusions spread by the leaders of Indian National Congress such as Gandhi, Nehru and others:

Ghairat Annakh Wala Je Khoon Hunda

Dehli Takht Zaalam Saathon Khasade Naan

Banner, Bipin, Gandhi, Madanmohan Varge

Eh Firangiyaan De Boot Jhasde Naan

(If our leaders had fought for our self respect

We would not have lost our country and rule

The kind of Bannerji, Bipin Chander Pal, Gandhi

And Madanmohan Malviya would not

Have Licked the Boots of the British)

Deputationaan Te Resolutionaan Te

Muft Dhan Kharab Karaaya Kiyon

Naram Dil Congressi Leadraan Nun

Tusin Sutiyo Leader Banyaya Kiyon

(Deputations and resolutions are waste of money

These leaders of Congress who have soft corner

for the British have become leaders

Because you are asleep and not conscious)

They also pointed out the old Indian tradition:

Kade Mangyian Milann Azadiyan Na

Hunde Tarliyan Naal Na Raj Loko

(Freedom is not obtained by begging

By appeals political power is not won)

Karo Na Minnat Ainwe Bano Na Kaiyar

Fardo Talwar Ehnan Nahin Rahnna

Agge Veero Arjiyan Ne Ki Banna Liya

Zalam Firangyian Ne Desh Kha Liya

(Do not petition like cowards

Take the sword and they will run

What have all the petitions done?

Brutal British have plundered our land)

They called upon the Hindustani soldiers to revolt:

Tusin Lardo Jaa Key Khaatar Goriyan De

Singho Bholiyo Karde Khyal Kiyon Nahin

Desan Dujiyan Te Nit Karo Dhaavey

Mulk Apna Laindey Sambhaal Kiyon Nahin

Tibet, Cheen, Africa Nun Fateh Kardey

Dita Dushmanan Hath Dakhal Kiyon Nahin

Utho Azadi Da Lavo Jhaaka

Ralke Kheddey Kiyon Gulal Nahin

(You go and fight for the British

You brave lions just think about it

You fight in far and distant lands

Why not take charge of your own land?

You have subdued Tibet, China, Africa for the British

Why not show your valor to our enemy the British?

Arise and breathe the fresh air of Freedom

Why do you not play Holi with the blood of British?)

Faujan Waliyo Tusaan Di Matt Maari

Lokaan Waste Karo Lardayian

Vairi Tusan Da Gheriya Vich Europe

Vaila Saanbh Layo Dheriyan Dhayian Kiyon

(Soldiers awaken and come to your senses

Why are you fighting for the others, the British

Our enemy is caught in Europe

Take advantage of this situation and revolt)

They also exposed those 'religious leaders' who collaborated with the British in dividing the people on the basis of religion:

Kazi, Pandatan , Ate Giyaniyan Ne

Yudh Karan Da Vachan Sunawnna Na

Bhaunkan Raat Diney Bhukhye Tukrdiaan De

Khali Rahannge Dhidh Bharavanna Na

Haddi Pun Pai Ju Thode Khalsa Ji

Marda Dhan Puja Wala Khawna Na

Vaja Mominan Di Kam Luchyian De

Deel Dol Nun Vaikh Bhul Jawana Na

Saanun Lord Na Amayan Afayan Di

Ilam Ragard Forde Uttey Lawnna Na

(Kazis, Pandits and Giyanis of Gurudwara

Will not speak of fighting the British

They bark like dogs day and night

Looking for the crumbs from the British

If you listen to them your bellies will remain empty

Your bones will be eaten by cancer

If you eat the crumbs that they give

They wear garb of holy men but

Their deeds are those of devil

Do not be fooled by their garb

We do not need useless degrees of BA and MA

We want solutions to our problems)

To organize the Hindustanis abroad and in India for revolution was the chief aim of the Ghadar Party. Ghadar, and other publications of the Yugantar Ashram became tools for this organizing activity. Soon there were Ghadar Party branches in China, Malaya, Siam, Europe, the Philippines, Africa, Hongkong, Singapore, Panama, Argentina, Brazil, Iran, Afghanistan, Japan, Russia, amongst other locations. Wherever there were Hindustanis, there were Ghadar Party branches. By 1916, it is estimated that one million copies of Ghadar were published per week.

Special issues of Ghadar were also printed in Nepali, Bengali, Pashto, Gujrati, as well as many other languages. The British government used every means to stop the circulation of Ghadar and other publications of the Yugantar Ashram, mainly to stop it from reaching India, but they were not successful. The Ghadarites always found ways and means of distributing their publications in India in spite of proscription and efforts by the British to stop the distribution of Ghadar.

The British Government also tried with all its might to slander, suppress, and eradicate the Ghadar Movement abroad by conniving with the Governments of Canada and the USA and by recruiting spies and their agents such as Hopkinson and others to closely watch the activities of the Ghadarites. For this purpose they also recruited a temple priest in San Francisco and some Granthis in Gurudwaras. As a result of this pressure, Lala Hardyal was arrested on March 25, 1914. Because of Hopkinson's reposts, he was forced to leave the USA in April 1914.

Return to India

The Ghadarites decided that the time was ripe to organize a revolt in the army against the British, as the first world war was approaching and it was only through armed force that the British were able to subjugate Hindustan. With men and materiel flowing

out of India to aid in the war effort, the forces of occupation were perched precariously, depleted and vulnerable to attack. Therefore they decided to organize and return to Hindustan. In August 1914 huge rallies and public meetings were organized, where it was decided that all the Hindus abroad should return to Hindustan and participate in the armed revolt against the British. The Executive Committee of the Ghadar Party met and decided to call upon all the Ghadarites everywhere to return to India and organize the revolt. Kartar Singh Sarabha, one of the youngest Ghadarites, was a student at Berkeley and left right away with other Ghadarites. The president of Ghadar Party, Sohan Singh Bhakhna, who was in Japan, also organized to return home with others. Similarly, the Ghadarites planned to return from other parts of the world. They left a few organizers abroad to carry on the work. They worked out the following plan:

1. To contact all the revolutionary groups in India on their return and unite with them.
2. The Ghadarite organizers should travel from village to village and prepare the people for the revolt against the British.
3. To propagate amongst the soldiers in the cantonments and arouse them to revolt against the British. A special committee was elected for this work.
4. For acquisition of weapons, a special group was organized.
5. A special group to carry on the work of publishing literature to distribute amongst the people and soldiers.
6. To further strengthen relations with all those movements who were fighting against colonialism for their national liberation and seek their help.
7. To seek possibilities of help from Germany and Turkey who were fighting against the British.

To get help from enemies of the British, Barakatullah was sent to Kabul to organize this work. Kapur Singh Mohi met with Sun Yat Sen to seek the help of the Chinese revolutionaries. Sohan Singh Bhakhna also met with the German Counselor in Tokyo in

this regard. Teja Singh Sutantar had joined the Turkish Military Academy for military training to prepare for the revolutionary storms. Ghadarites returned to India through sea and land. The Komagata Maru, SS Korea, and the Namsang were some of the ships on which thousands of Ghadarite returned home:

> *"The most important vessel to leave San Francisco was the SS Korea, which left for Hong Kong on the 29th August...Before the ship left San Francisco Maulvi Barkatullah, Ram Chand and Bhagwan Singh came aboard and gave the following advice, 'your duty is clear. Go to India and stir up rebellion in every corner of the country. Arms will be provided for you on your arrival in India."*

It is estimated that close to 8000 Ghadarites returned to Hindustan to aid in the revolt by 1916. In a speech in Dehra Dun Bhai, Parmanand declared that five thousand Ghadarites had returned with him.

The British authorities knew about the plans of the Ghadarites. They had also seen the Declaration of War in Ghadar and also had information through their agents. They issued an ordinance in September 1914, according to which provincial governments were empowered to intern people entering India from abroad even if they were Indian citizens. Bengal and Punjab governments were given these powers first because a great deal of ships on which the Ghadarites were returning were to dock at Calcutta. They also established a detention centre in Ludhiana where those passengers who were suspected of being Ghadarites were interned. The passengers of Komagatu Maru were the first victims of this ordinance. Sohan Singh Bhakhna and others were arrested from the ship Namsang and brought to Ludhiana. Ghadarites traveling in Tosha Maru were also arrested and taken to different jails such as Montgomery and Multan. But the Ghadarites made it through Colombo, Madras, and Bombay.

In India the Ghadarites developed close working relationships with other revolutionary groups such as the revolutionaries of Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, etc., who later formed the Revolutionary Party of India which declared in 1917:

"The immediate object of the revolutionary party in the domain of politics is to establish a Federal Republic of the United States of India by an organized armed revolution. The final constitution of this Republic shall be framed and declared at a time when the representatives of India shall have the power to carry out their decisions. But the basic principles of this Republic shall be universal suffrage, and the abolition of all systems which make the exploitation of man by man possible;...In this Republic the electors shall have the right to recall their representatives if so desired, otherwise the democracy shall become a mockery. In this Republic, the legislature shall have the power to control the executives and replace them whenever necessity will arise.

The Revolutionary Party is not national but international in the sense that its ultimate object is to bring harmony in the world by respecting and guaranteeing the diverse interests of the different nations; it aims not at competition but at cooperation between the different nations and states, and in this respect it follows the footsteps of the great Indian Rishis and of Bolshevik Russia in the modern age. Good for humanity is no vain and empty word for Indian revolutionaries."

Vishnu Ganesh Pingley, Kartar Singh Sarabha, Ras Bihari Bose, Bhai Parmanand, Hafiz Abdullah, Sachinder Nath Sanyal, and others played very important roles in developing these close relationships with other revolutionary groups. They aimed to overthrow the British rule by force of arms and build a new society. For this aim they were willing to unite and work together with all those forces that were working for this common aim of liberating Hindustan.

Amritsar was established as the control centre for the activity of the Ghadar party which had to be changed to Lahore on February 6,1915 due to security considerations. After analyzing all the reports from the organizers amongst the army and civilians, it was decided on February 12,1915 that the date of uprising will be February 21,1915. The plan was to occupy the cantonments of Mian Mir, Ferozepur, Meerut, Lahore, and Delhi and proclaim the Republic of India. Garrisons in Kohat, Bannu and Dinapur were also to revolt on the same day. Kartar Singh Sarabha was to take control of Ferozepur and Pingle to march to Delhi from Meerut with the 128th Battalion.

Dr. Mathura Singh was sent to the frontier areas of the Northwest to organize the Afridis and others. Nidhan Singh Chugha, Gurmukh, Singh and Harnam Singh were sent to Jhelum, Rawalpindi, and Hoti Mardan. Parmanand went to Peshawar. Others were sent to Ambala, Meerut, Lucknow, Allahabad, Benares, Dinapur, and Faizabad to raise the banner of revolt. They also decided that the flag of this revolt and republic would be a tricolor of Red, Green and Yellow with two swords crossing in the centre. The organization of revolt in the eastern part of India, such as in Bengal and Assam, was to be coordinated by the Bengali revolutionaries. The rebellion was to engulf the British Empire from Peshawar to Hongkong.

Unfortunately the British government got wind of the uprising through their agents. The Ghadarites changed the date of uprising to February 19 instead of February 21, after they determined that the authorities knew of their plans. But the British authorities acted swiftly and disarmed the Indian troops in the above mentioned garrisons and interned them. Several leaders of Ghadar Party and organizers were arrested and imprisoned in Lahore; 82 of them were charged for sedition in Lahore Conspiracy Case on April 26,1916 and 17 Ghadarites were declared absconding and international non-bailable warrants for their arrest were issued.

Michael O'Dwyer, the governor of Punjab, asked the British government to remove all provisions of appeal in the legal provisions of the courts. The British government brought in "Defence of India Rule" to carry out summary trials of the Ghadarites. This ordinance was opposed by all the Indian members of the legislative assembly. A special tribune was set up which held its hearings in camera in a Lahore jail. On September 13,1915, 24 Ghadarites were sentenced to death and the rest were given life imprisonment. This judgment of the tribunal raised a wave of protest and demonstrations against the British all over India. As a result the Viceroy Lord Hardinge himself intervened and

converted the death sentence of 17 Ghadarites into life imprisonment and reduced the term of imprisonment for 7 Ghadarites. On November 16, seven Ghadarites were hanged.

After Lahore, arrests took place in Benaras and Delhi. Sachinder Nath Sanyal was exiled to Andaman jail known as Kala Pani and others were given varying rigorous sentences by the special tribunal. The Tribunal declared that they were all part of the same movement with its centre in Lahore.

The Ghadarites did not get disheartened by this set back and continued carrying on their work. Arrests and imprisonments followed them. In the second Lahore Conspiracy case, 102 Ghadarites were tried. This case began on October 25, 1915 and sentences were handed down on March 30, 1916. Seven Ghadarites were sentenced to death, 45 were given life sentences and the rest were given rigourous imprisonment varying from 8 months to four years. Eleven were let free.

Several Ghadarites were hanged, sentenced for life and given rigorous imprisonment in the third, fourth and fifth Lahore Conspiracy Cases. According to one estimate, a total of 145 Ghadarites were hanged, 308 were given sentences longer than 14 years.

Outside India the Ghadarites had organized revolts amongst the Indian soldiers. They started organizing the soldiers of the 26th Punjabi regiment in Hongkong. This regiment had been brought in 1912 to suppress the Chinese democratic revolution led by Sun Yat Sen. The British officer could go home on vacations but the Hindustani soldiers had to remain on duty. Besides the 26th Punjabi, the 25th Punjabi, 126th Baluchi and 50th Artillery was also stationed here. The Ghadar Party had carried out work amongst them. Especially after the Komagata Maru incident, they had a great deal of anti-British sentiment and Ghadar was regularly distributed amongst them. On June 14, several of the soldiers in these regiments were arrested and court-martialed for distributing Ghadar and sent back to India and imprisoned.

In Singapore two regiments, Fifth Holly Light and Malaya State Guide, were garrisoned. The Ghadarites started their work

in 1914 in Singapore and through Ghadar, called upon the soldiers to revolt against the British and not participate in the war on the British side. The British authorities, suspecting something was amiss, transferred the Malaya State Guide to Penang. On the night of February 15,1914, the soldiers were ordered to deposit their ammunition and arms in the depot. As a result the officers refused to obey this order and shot several of the officers. The British reinforcements arrived by the 18th of February and crushed this rebellion. Two leaders of the mutiny were hanged and 38 were shot dead, and on the side of the British 8 officers, 9 soldiers and 17 civilians were killed.

In Rangoon in January 1915, the 130th Baluchi regiment revolted. They did not want to fight in the war for the British. On January 15, 200 soldiers of this regiment were court-martialed. Four soldiers were hanged, 69 were given life imprisonment and 126 were given rigorous imprisonment for varying terms. Pandit Sohan Lal Pathak, one of the outstanding leaders of the Ghadar Party was hanged on February 10,1916 in Mandalay jail for inciting rebellion against the British rule. At his martyrdom another Ghadarite Amar Singh wrote:

Chadha Mansoor Phansi Par Pukara Ishk Bazon Ko

Yeh Beeda Hai Tabahi Ka Uthaye Jiska Ji Chaahey

(From the Gallows Mansoor called those who dared to love

This path of self-sacrifice, those who march on it, should do so with complete free will)

Burma had also become an important centre of the Ghadarites. Several Ghadarites were tried and sentenced in two Mandalay Conspiracy Cases.

In December 1915, a government-in-exile of Free Hindustan was established in Kabul, Afghanistan, with Raja Mohinder Pratap as President, Maulavi Barkatullah, Prime Minister, Maulavi Abaidullah Sindhi, Home Minister, Maulavi Bashir, War Minister and Champakaran Pillai, Foreign Minister. All of them were members of the Ghadar Party except Raja Mahendra Pratap. This government-in-exile carried on work on various fronts including

the diplomatic fronts by establishing relationships with anti-British governments such as Turkey, Germany, Japan, China, etc.

The Ghadarites also organized the Hindustani prisoners of war in Turkey, Germany, Mesopotamia, and the Middle East. The Ghadarites in Turkey fought against the British in Iran, Baluchistan and Turkey. In Constantinople, they decided that they will attack the British soldiers in Iran, move on to Baluchistan and then enter Punjab from there. They also worked amongst the Hindustani soldiers in the British army in Iran and Iraq, especially in Basra and Bushahir. It is here that the Indian Independence Army was organized by the Ghadarites to invade British India from Iran. Amba Prasad Sufi was the leader of the Ghadar Party in Shiraz. He was joined by Kedar Nath, Rishi Kesh Letha and Amin Chaudhry. This army of the Ghadarites reached the borders of Baluchistan where the British army was very weak. General Sykes tried to recruit the help of the Baluchi tribal chiefs. This Ghadarite army attacked the frontier city of Karman and arrested the British Counsel and turned Karman into its base of operations.

The British pressed into their service the Aga Khan and his brother. Aga Khan's brother was captured by the Ghadarite army and shot dead. The army of the Ghadarites also defeated the British forces in the province of Sistan in Afghanistan. The Ghadar army chased the British forces into the Karamshir area of Baluchistan. Here they heard the news and declaration of the Free Hindustan by the government-in-exile headed by Mohendra Pratap.

From here the Ghadar army advanced towards Karachi and took over the coastal towns of Gawador and Dawar. The Baluch chief of Bampur declared his independence from the British rule and joined the Ghadar forces. Meanwhile, however, the war in Europe took a turn for the better for the British. Turkey was defeated and Baghdad came under British control, cutting the supply lines of for the Ghadar army, which finally led to its defeat. They retreated to regroup in Shiraz. The British army, reinforced by their victory in Turkey and Iraq, attacked Shiraz. The Ghadar army fought very bravely but was defeated. Amba Prasad Sufi, the leader of the Ghadarites was killed in this battle. The Ghadarites carried on Guerrilla warfare along with the Iranian partisans but when the Iranian patriots were defeated, they left Iran in 1919.

Ghadar was sent through China to Russia and then through Russia, it used to go through Iran and Mesopotamia to the Indian troops stationed there. The 15th Lancers, stationed in Basra revolted and 64 soldiers were court-martialed. Similarly, the 24th Punjabi and 22nd Pahari also revolted.

Before returning to India in 1914-15, the Ghadar Party had elected a new collective to carry on the work. The following were elected to the executive committee:

1. Bhai Bhagwan Singh---President
2. Bhai Santokh Singh---General Secretary
3. Munshi Ram---Treasurer
4. Ram Chand---Manager of the paper
5. Gobind Bihari Lal---Editor
6. Godha Ram---Urdu Editor
7. Gopal Singh Sohi---Punjabi Editor
8. Hari Singh Fakir---Assistant Editor
9. Sundar Singh Ghali---Office Secretary
10. Ram Singh Dhuleta---Staff
11. Mahadev Aboj---Staff
12. Imamdin---Staff
13. Nidhan Singh---Staff
14. Bishan Singh Hindi---Staff

As it has been mentioned, one million copies of the Ghadar were published every week by 1916. On January 22,1917, the movement was officially registered as the Hindustan Ghadar Party in San Francisco to comply with the American law, with its headquarters at 5 Wood Street.

The Ghadarites were defeated but they were not crushed. They regrouped and decided to carry on their work to fight another battle and yet another until Hindustan was free. On the

international scene, the defeat of Turkey and Germany had created new difficulties and an unfavorable situation. The end of war had also given rise to another event of great international significance: the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, which had tremendous effect on the Ghadar Party's work and direction. The news of the triumph of the workers' and peasants' revolution in Russia inspired the people of Hindustan tremendously. There was great enthusiasm on the part of workers, peasants, intellectuals, and enlightened individuals to find out more and in detail about the achievements of this revolution. The Ghadarites had been working closely with all the revolutionaries internationally such as the Irish revolutionaries, the Chinese revolutionaries, the Russian revolutionaries, as well as with the Egyptian, African, Latin American, and Algerian revolutionaries.

They had also been influenced by socialist ideas and movements, and had close working relations with the trade union movement. In North America they had aclose association with the IWW. Agnes Smedley, Emma Goldman, Mary Lyon Howzer, Mrs. Carrington Lewis, Freida Birch, and Chas Lester were some of the famous socialist and trade union leaders with whom the Ghadarites had good working relations. These leaders of the working class and democratic public opinion had assisted the Ghadarites tremendously in their fight in the courts of Seattle and San Francisco. Agnes Smedley and her friends including Tarak Nath Das, formed Friends of Freedom of India in 1919, to popularize and support the cause of the Ghadarites in North America. Friends of Freedom of India, had many socialists, communists, and labor organizers as well as well-known writers and artists such as Upton Sinclair. Tarak Nath's paper, Free Hindustan, which was published in Seattle in 1907, declared in bold letters on its masthead, "Workers of the World Unite, You Have Nothing to Lose But Chains."

The triumph of the Bolshevik revolution naturally attracted their attention and drew them to the Soviet Union and its experience, just as the French revolution, American revolution, and the Mexican revolution of 1911 had drawn their attention earlier. They were anxious to meet and learn from the leaders of

the October revolution who had overthrown the rule of exploiters, and who had established a state of the exploited and the oppressed. The Ghadarites called the Russian revolutionaries the Russian Ghadarites and considered them as their Ghadarite brothers fighting for the same cause of national and social liberation. In turn the Bolsheviks and the newly formed Soviet state had declared unconditional support for the people of Hindustan in their struggle against the British colonialism. Several Ghadarites had been in Russia during the period of the Bolshevik revolution and the Russian revolutionaries had assisted them in distributing Ghadar. By now these revolutionaries had succeeded in overthrowing their oppressors and formed their own state and were charting a new path hitherto unknown. Ghadarites were greatly excited by these prospects.

The Ghadar Party sent Rattan Singh and Santokh Singh as its representatives to the Soviet Union to learn from the Bolsheviks. Talso attended the 4th Congress of the Communist International (Comintern) as the Hindustani representatives:

> *"The IV Congress of the Communist International, which met in Moscow in November 1922, was attended by two representatives deputed by the Ghadar Party in California, one being Santokh Singh as a 'delegate from India' and the other Rattan Singh. Both of these men were thorough going Ghadar supporters."*

> *..."Santokh Singh it may be said , had also attended the Second World Congress of the R.I.L.U., held in Moscow in November 1922...at a formal meeting of the Ghadar Party to welcome him, he said that Russia, America and Turkey had secured freedom through revolution, and that India would have to do the same."*

The fourth congress of the Comintern sent a telegram to the All Indian Trade Union Congress, Lahore, and had advised them;

> *"No amelioration of living conditions is possible while imperialist exploitation exists. It is for this reason that you will play an important part in the struggle for national independence. Prepare for this historic role. The advanced proletariat of fifty-two countries represented at this Congress is entirely on your side.*

Beware of the false friendship and the misleading advice of labour leaders that are subservient to imperialism."

Comintern also pointed out:

"Only an agrarian revolution committed to the expropriation of the great landowners can arouse the vast peasant masses, who will be a key factor in the struggle against imperialism. The bourgeois nationalists fear of agrarian demands and their efforts to water them down in every possible way (as in India, Persia, Egypt) are an indication of the close connection between the native bourgeoisie and the great feudal bourgeois landowners, and the former's intellectual and political dependence on the latter. The revolutionary forces must use these hesitations and uncertainties to make a thorough, ongoing criticism and exposure of the compromises made by the bourgeois leaders of the nationalist movement. It is precisely these compromisers that hinder the organization and rallying of the working masses, as is shown by the bankruptcy of the tactic of passive resistance."

Rattan Singh and Santokh Singh had the opportunity to exchange opinions and views with the Bolshevik leaders including Lenin. They were deeply and profoundly influenced by the fight that the Soviet Union was waging to consolidate the gains of revolution and the fight that it was carrying on against the 18 imperialist countries including, the US, Britain, Canada, France, and Germany, who had invaded the Soviet Union. They visited various parts of Soviet Union, met with workers, peasants, and intellectuals, and were convinced that the path that was being charted out in the Soviet Union would be helpful in the national and social emancipation of India. They were deeply moved by the unconditional support of the Soviet Union and Soviet Ghadarites (Bolsheviks) for the emancipation of Hindustan.

In India after the war, a great revolutionary upsurge had gained momentum. This movement had become a forest fire in Punjab and Northwestern Provinces due to the repression of the Rowlatt Act and Crawling orders. The British government had carried out massacres in Jalianwala Bagh in Amritsar and strafed with Royal Air Force planes in Gujjranwala, killing hundreds of

people and injuring thousands. In Afghanistan, Ammanullah had declared Afghanistan's independence from the British and the anti-colonial movement of Khilafat in Turkey stirred them a great deal. Barkatullah, a Ghadarite, and Ammanullah had collaborated greatly in their anti-British activities in Afghanistan. With Ammanullah at the head of Independent Afghanistan, gave tremendous boost and status to the work of Ghadar Party. The news of the Bolshevik revolution and the state of workers and peasants had tremendously inspired these insurgent people. They were not cowed down by the repression of the British. After the British had killed several people in a firing in Lahore one of the poets expressed the sentiments of this movement in the following lines:

Shahid ki jo maut hai wo kaum ki hayat hai
Shahid ka jo hai lahu wo kaum ki zakat hai
Katain jo chand daaliyan to chaman ho hara bhara
Katain jo chand gardanain to kaum ki hayat hai

(The death of the martyrs is life of the nation
The blood of the martyrs is the offering of the nation
Few branches fall so that the garden can bloom
Few heads fall so that the nation can have life)

Rattan Singh, Santokh Singh and Barkatullah were representatives of the Ghadar Party who traveled in various countries to consolidate and strengthen the work of the Ghadar Party. Rattan Singh traveled to India, America, Latin America, Europe, Russia and the Middle East. Teja Singh Sutantar was leading the Ghadar Party in Turkey. Santokh Singh undertook the work of organizing the Kirti group of Communists in India and the publication of the paper Kirti, "Rattan Singh while still in America, had suggested the starting of the Kirti and in his first letter wrote...'business could only be successful if the Kirti was successful...we are trying to send money soon for this paper.'" In January 1926 the Kirti was advertised as follows:

"This journal will be the voice of Indian workers in America and Canada and will be dedicated to the sacred memory of those

heroes and martyrs who awakened sleeping India...In February following the first issue appeared, bearing on its title page the picture of a dead labourer lying on his funeral pyre, amidst factories, fields, etc.,...the sense of his labours when alive and surrounded by tools such as the hammer and pickax, the whole obviously intended to convey the idea that the deceased had succumbed to the hard tasks he had to perform during his lifetime. The paper has ever since its appearance consistently advocated the cause and ideals of the Ghadar conspirators of 1914 and 1915, it has glorified the Babbar Akalis as martyrs and heroes...The magazine has been welcomed by the Hindustan Ghadar, which issued an appeal for subscriptions for it."

Another intelligence report points out:

"the Ghadar Party in 1925 established a Workers and Peasant Party (Kirti Kisan Party) in the Punjab. Its organ, the Kirti, a purely communistic production, was subsidized by the Ghadar Party in America. The aims of the Kirti Kisan Party were (1) to achieve complete independence from British Imperialism by every possible method in order to liberate the workers and peasants from political, economic and social serfdom and to establish their democratic power; and (2) to organize the workers and peasants. The Kirti Kisan Party was a counter part in India of the Ghadar Party organization in America and it professed communist creed."

The Kirti Party also organized the youth and had close relations with Naujawan Bharat Sabha, with Bhagat Singh as one of its leaders. Bhagat Singh also worked for some time on the Kirti Urdu edition. Bhagat Singh's uncle, Ajit Singh, who was in exile was very closely connected to the Ghadarites in Argentina and Brazil. At one time it was intended by the Ghadar Party to invite Ajit Singh to be the editor of Ghadar. In Britain the Ghadar Party could not exist legally because the British had outlawed it in their empire. Therefore Rattan Singh founded the Indian Workers Association with the same aims of the Ghadar Party.

Barkatullah played a very important role in the Muslim parts of the Soviet Union working with the Hijris, and also cooperating

with the Bolsheviks. After the declaration of Afghanistan's independence, Ammanullah sent an official delegation with Barkatullah at its head to Soviet Union. This mission known as the Barkatullah mission was received very warmly by the Soviet government. A treaty of peace and friendship was signed between the two governments. Barkatullah went to the Soviet Union during the civil war, and exposed the dastardly deeds of the British and the French amongst the eastern regions of the Soviet Union, where the colonial powers were using their tested weapon of divide and rule on the religious basis by inciting the Muslim inhabitants against the gains of the revolution and the Soviet Union. Barkatullah's work in the Soviet Union in support of the revolution and its gains was an expression of the Ghadar Party's deep-seated internationalism. As a result of their internationalism, they had developed close ties with other revolutionaries and revolutionary governments such as the government of Ammanullah in Afghanistan, Fakhri Pasha in Turkey and the Soviet government. Barkatullah also attended the congress of the League Against Imperialism in Brussels in 1928 as a delegate, which passed a resolution on India stating:

"The general council of the League against Imperialism declares its complete solidarity with the Indian peoople in the latter's opposition to the British government's proposal of a commission of the British Parliament to investigate India's fitness for self government.

The appointment of this commission of the exploiters to the grant 'reforms' to the peoples whom they exploit is nothing but an impudent farce, and the general council heartily supports the Indian national movement's resolve to boycott the commission.

The general council notes with disgust that the British Labour party leaders and members of parliament have made common cause with the British imperialists on this question, by supporting the conservative government's proposals of a commission an by endorsing without any but the weakest support to comrade Saklatvala in Parliament, the participation of two labour representatives.

The general council declares that this open united front of the British capitalists and British labour leaders in defence of British imperialism which has no parallel since the black days of August 1914, is as harmful to the workers of the oppressor countries, since they are exploited by the same ruling class.

The league against Imperialism pledges the wholehearted support of all its adherent organisations and sections to the Indian national movement in this struggle. At the same time it urges all genuine enemies of imperialist oppression in India to concentrate on rallying the masses around the positive slogan of complete independence for India - the sole real threat to the power of British imperialism...and on election of a constituent assembly to consider the entire question of the political future of India, which should be prepared by the creation of local committees, mass demonstrations and the widest possible participation of the masses of people generally."

Rattan Singh in this period traveled on an Afghan passport issued by the Afghan government as the British government had impounded his passport. During his travels Rattan Singh visited the branches of Ghadar Party in Mexico, Cuba, Central America, Panama, Brazil and Argentina and met with Bujha Singh and Bhagat Singh Bilga. After his visit to Argentina, it was decided that Bujha Singh would take the first group of Ghadarites from Argentina back to India via Moscow. They were to receive political training and education in Moscow. The Ghadar Party had issued a second "Return to India Call" and said that the Ghadarites should return to India via Moscow. The intelligence bureau reported that, "there are at present 35 students of the Ghadar Party undergoing training in Moscow."

The Kirti Party had its independent and separate organization from other communist groups in India and had direct links with the Comintern. They also published Lal Jhanda and Lal Dhandora papers besides Kirti. They assigned Kisan Sabhas to organize the peasantry and the trade unions of workers in towns and cities. Overseas the Hindustan Ghadar propagated the cause of the liberation of India and popularized the work of the Kirti Party and

other revolutionaries. To lead the work of the Kirti Party, a revolutionary committee was elected with Santokh Singh its secretary, Karam Singh Cheema, Rattan Singh, Udham Singh Kasel and Gurmukh Singh as members. The last three members were in exile and could not enter India and were based abroad. One by one they would come to India secretly while others traveled to the Ghadar Party headquarters in San Francisco, as well as other parts of the world including the Soviet Union.

On the first anniversary of the Kirti paper this revolutionary committee pointed out in its report:

1. The objective for which the publication of Kirti was started, we have made all the efforts to fulfill that goal.
2. The objective of Kirti is neither Swaraj or Home Rule but complete independence of Hindustan and rule of workers and peasants. We stand on this unwaveringly and will stand for these objectives in future.
3. India can achieve complete independence by those means only by which other enslaved countries have gained their independence. It can not be achieved by any other means such as boycott, Satyagrah etc. We stand for revolutionary methods and will do so in future.
4. In Kirti's view the struggle of the people of Hindustan for liberation and socialism is a link in the chain of the struggle of all the peoples of the world for liberation. Therefore we will inform all the revolutionaries of the world about the struggles of Hindustan's people and inform the people of Hindustan of their struggles as we are part of one struggle. In the past one year we have been writing about the liberation struggle of the people of China and Afghanistan.We have written about the coal miners struggle in Britain, danger of fascism in Italy and the invasion of Abyssinia by fascist Italy and other international events. In future we will continue to do so.
5. A workers' and peasants' state has come into being in Russia and the people of Russia are building a new system and are marching towards socialism. We have provided

full information to our readers about these matters and we will continue to do so in future.

6. Martyrs of a nation are its fundamental heritage. We have been writing about their deeds and life. In coming times we will continue to write about the Ghadarite martyrs of 1914-1916, including Babbar Akali and other young revolutionaries who have sacrificed their lives for our nation.

In 1929 a great wave of peasant unrest gripped Hindustan from Kanya Kumari to Kashmir. Also, many workers strikes were taking place at this time. Demonstrations and rallies against British rule were being organized all over the country. Bhagat Singh and his comrades had thrown a bomb in the Assembly to awaken the masses. The Army refused to open fire on a demonstration in Peshawar. The whole country was in fervor. The Ghadarites of the Kirti Party tirelessly organized against the British rule and guided the people. They were also instrumental in organising the Naujawan Sabha led by Bhagat Singh. The constitution of the Naujavan Bharat Sabha defined the main aims and objectives of the Sabha as follows:

1. To establish a complete independent republic of labourers and peasants throughout India.
2. To inspire in the hearts of the young men of the country the feelings of patriotism and spirit of sacrifice for forming a united nationality in India.
3. To create the spirit of general toleration among the public considering religion as a matter of personal belief of man's and to act upon the same fully.
4. To show interest for and help every economic and social movement which is quite free from communal feelings and which is calculated to take us near our goal to establish a complete independent republic of labourers and peasants throughout India.
5. To organise labourers and peasants

Along with Kisan Sabhas, Naujawan Sabha, workers and other people were in the front ranks of these agitations and

struggles. They published in Kirti the full text of the statement issued by Bhagat Singh and Dutt in their defence. Kirti fully supported the revolutionary youth and at the same time it advised them through its pages against the dangers of individual terrorism. In 1928 Abdul Majid started Mahnatkash which was also an organ of the Kirti Party.

In March 1931, Rajguru, Sukhdev, and Bhagat Singh were hanged by the British. This further fueled the fire against the British. The Kirti Party decided to bring out a weekly paper Mazdoor Kisan (Workers and Peasants) in Hindi and Urdu. It organized conferences and rallies along with Nau Jawan Sabha in Shekhupur, Multan, Gujaranwala, Layalpur, Rohtak, Jullundhur and other places.

The writings of Ferozuddin Mansur and Munshi Ahmed Din, dealt with the burning questions of the day. Mazdoor Kisan also published the statements and speeches of communists arrested in the Meerut Conspiracy Case and also exposed all those who collaborated with the British. They openly opposed the Communal Suffrage.

In 1942 the Kirti party merged with the Communist Party of India feeling the need for unity of all the communists. After the partition of the Hindustan and transfer of the power to the Congress government, the Nehru government declared the Communist Party illegal. The communists had to go underground. This was the reward that the workers, peasants and communists had harvested.

The communists had to go underground, and they thought about the wisdom of policy that the leadership of the CPI was following by supporting the Congress and Nehru government. In 1948, the Ghadarites who had joined the CPI in 1942 formed their own Lal Party (Red Party), because they did not feel that the leadership of the CPI was revolutionary, instead of revolution they felt that the leadership of the CPI was tailing behind the leadership of Congress.

The Ghadarites wanted national liberation with social revolution. The leaders of both Congress and the CPI were

interested in national liberation without social revolution. They were on the social democratic path.

They wanted to manage the British system with Indian faces. Ghadarites were also opposed to the partition of the country on a religious basis, whereas both Congress and CPI were in the favour of dividing the country on the basis of religion and the creation of Pakistan. The Kirti party had vehemently opposed the Pakistan Resolution of the CPI in 1944, which divided the country on the basis of religion.

They also supported the Telangana uprising and the peasants uprising in Punjab and Eastern Punjab States Union (PEPSU), while the leadership of CPI was opposed to both of these struggles.

In 1952 the Ghadarites of the Lal Party once again rejoined the CPI after the change of the leadership of CPI, hoping that the new leadership would carry out the social revolution to the end and not tail behind Congress and Nehru. But these hopes were to be dashed to the ground. In 1958, the communists were elected in Kerala and formed the government and attempted to carry out serious land reforms.

The Congress government headed by the Nehru government dissolved the Kerala government in 1959 at the insistence of the Landlords of Kerala. The period of 1960-1964 saw one of the worst famines in India with millions of people starving to death. It created a great wave of discontent in the country leading to the defeat of the Congress party in the 1967 general elections in many states. A peasant uprising broke out in Naxalbari, which found its resonance in many parts of the country.

Baba Sohan Singh Bhakhna, the first president of the Ghadar Party declared that the aims and objectives for which the Ghadar Party had been formed in 1913 and for which the Ghadarites had made countless sacrifices.

Those aims, namely the social revolution in India had not been carried out. Baba Bujha Singh, a Ghadarite who was one of the leaders of the Ghadar Party in Argentina had returned to India via Moscow, echoed his sentiment and threw his full support

behind the Naxalbari uprising. And when the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) was formed, he was elected its leader in Punjab at the age of 78.

The Indian patriots, democrats and enlightened people abroad also echoed Baba Sohan Singh Bhakhna's call and fully supported the Naxalbari uprising. In Britain the Indian Workers Association had continued its work. A meeting was held in London around the time of the "Necessity for Change Conference" in November 1967 and it was decided to reactivate the Hindustani Ghadar Party in support of Naxalbari.

An ad hoc committee was formed to reorganize the Ghadar Party for the social revolution in India. Manchanda was elected its president and Hardial Bains was elected to be in charge of work in North America. When the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) was formed in 1969, the Ghadar Party became its external wing.

The Ghadarites were advised by CPI(M-L) and Charu Mazumdar, its General Secretary, to propagate the cause of the Indian revolution in the countries where they were resident. Ghadarites defended the cause of the Indian revolution through their paper Chingari and also organized people against racist attacks in Canada and Britain in close connection with the Canadian and British working class:

"There were two reasons why the Ghadar Party was founded in 1913; first to achieve the true aspirations of the Indian people to defeat the British Colonialism in India and to build a free and prosperous India, and secondly to fight racial discrimination in North America and other places where fascists organized by the British Colonialists were bullying the Indian residents...The two reasons on which the Ghadar Party was founded still remain. India is yet to gain her true independence and the Indians residing in the USA, Canada, Britain and other places have yet to achieve racial equality. It is for this that we have organized the new Ghadar Party."

The Ghadarites once again raised the slogan, "Blame the Canadian State for Racist Attacks", "Unite with the Canadian

People to Fight Against Racist Attacks" and they also followed the slogan "Self-Defence is the Only Way." Amongst the students and intelligentsia the Indian Progressive Study Groups came into being in Canada and the US as part of this trend.

At the time of the founding of the Ghadar Party, resolutions were passed in support of the Palestinian people, people of Indo-China, against US Imperialism, black people in their struggle against racism in the USA, and the people of Canada and Quebec in their struggle against the domination of USA. They also developed close working relations with the revolutionaries from Asia, Africa, and Latin America where great uprisings had taken place.

Ghadarites considered liberation of India as an integral part of the liberation of the world's people and supported the just struggles of all the peoples for liberation, dignity and honour whether in the Eastern or Western blocks. They participated in international gatherings and conferences to exchange views and learn from the experience of other revolutionaries. In this context the Internationalist Rally held in Montreal in April1978 was very important in which revolutionaries from all continents participated. The new Ghadarites like their earlier predecessors were harassed, persecuted and attacked for their views, convictions and activities.

The diplomatic offices of the Indian government also collaborated with the Canadian government in their persecution. Harsh Chaddha, a young man in his twenties was deported from Canada for his political activities.

Hardial Bains was not given Canadian citizenship for more than two decades because of his political views, was denied entry into the United States, and the Indian government withdrew his Passport in 1975 which was never reinstated, while they were giving calls for his deportation to India. Like the old Ghadarites, the new Ghadarites were not frightened by these threats and attacks. They carried on doing their work.

After the assassination of Charu Mazumdar and other revolutionary leadership of the CPI(M-L), the CPI(M-L) split into various factions. The Ghadar Party worked closely with all the

groups who aimed to bring about social revolution. A delegation of the Ghadar Party participated in a conference of CPI(M-L) in India in 1973 to discuss various problems of the Indian revolution. The Ghadarites emphasized the need for all revolutionaries to unite for the cause of Indian revolution.

In 1973 the then Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, came to visit Britain and North America.

The Ghadarites organized rallies and demonstrations against her visit in cooperation with several other organizations and groups condemning the torture and killing of thousands of youth branded as terrorists and extremists in false police encounters in Punjab, Bengal, Bihar, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kashmir, etc. The Ghadarites through the pages of Chingari, Lok Awaz, and other publications brought to light the violation of human rights, political persecution, killing and torture of the Naxalites, youth, and others.

In 1975, Indira Gandhi declared a state of emergency, which resulted in the dissolving of Parliament. A widespread movement in India and abroad started against this naked dictatorship. Workers, women, peasants, students, shopkeepers all were galvanized into a big storm.

The CPI supported the declaration of emergency while there were others who wanted to oppose Emergency in order to come to power themselves. The Ghadarites pointed out that the Emergency was one of the symptoms of colonial rule without colonialists. They believed that the Indian people should not be fooled by this or any party that would come into power and preserve the same rule under a different name.

The Ghadarites hoped that Indians would develop a people's movement against this rule. They called upon the people to develop their unity and not be fooled by the "United Front" of Jan Sangh, CPI(M) and others because they all wanted to preserve the old rule. They brought the truth of the matter under the slogan "Indira Gandhi, Morarji Desai, Chor Chor Mauserey Bhai," that both Indira Gandhi and Morarji Desai represented the same forces and that they were brother and sister in preserving neo-colonial rule.

Congress and Indira Gandhi were thoroughly defeated in the elections held in 1977 and a coalition of several other parties came to power in the centre.

One of the first acts of this coalition government of "restoring democracy" was the firing of striking workers of Kanpur in which several workers were killed. This act revealed how the new coalition was not interested in the social transformation of Indian society, but were perpetuating the rule of the ruling elites with hook or crook.

In October 1977 the Ghadarites held a congress in which they issued a call to all Ghadarites to return to India to further consolidate and strengthen the unity of the revolutionary forces who wanted to take up the problems of India and search for real solutions.This was the third return of the Ghadarites to India since 1913. The Ghadarites started a paper People's Voice in India to develop discussion for the unity of the revolutionary forces. Like the old Ghadarites, they built ties and working relations with other revolutionary, democratic, and progressive organizations and forces.

As a result of this work the Communist Ghadar Party of India came into being in 1980. Communist Ghadar Party declared at its founding that only the people of India, workers, peasants, women, youth, students, all the nations, and nationalities by their united forces can liberate India from medieval darkness and bring about prosperity, freedom, enlightenment and dignity to India. They would have to rely on their own forces to carry out such a transformation.

They must all unite irrespective of their religious, political, ideological, caste, linguistic, and regional differences. Only they could establish a democratic India in which the rights of all the peoples will be respected and honoured.

It called upon all the people of India to support the just struggles of all the oppressed and exploited abroad such as the struggle of the Palestinian people, South African people, workers struggle in Europe and Latin America, etc. It also condemned the racist attacks on the Indian people residing abroad in Britain,

Canada, Australia, the US, and other places. They called upon the Indian residents in these countries to unite with the people of their countries to fight against the racist and fascist attacks.

On the cultural front, the Ghadarites also took various initiatives. Along with other organizations, they helped to organize the International Sports and Cultural Festivals in Canada, Britain and India, which were attended by thousands of people.

The first international sports and cultural festival took place in Vancouver in 1981 and was attended by more than 40,000 people. It was during this festival that the first World Cup Kabbadi matches were held. In 1982 the festival was held in India and in 1983 it was held in Britain.

These festivals were held under the slogan of 'Sports and Culture in service of the people." Thousands of people participated and supported these festivals, which helped to develop friendly relations between the people of South Asia as well as with South Asians living abroad. Kabbadi teams and other sportsmen from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, the USA, Canada, etc. participated in these festivals. Cultural personalities and performers from different parts of South Asia also participated.

They also organized annual sports tournaments and cultural events to honour heroic martyrs such as Bhagat Singh, Mewa Singh, Udham Singh, etc., in cooperation with other groups and associations such as the East Indian Defence Committee and the Desh Bhagat Sports and Cultural Society. Just like the old Ghadaries, the new Ghadarites also conveyed their message through poems, songs, plays, dramas, stories, etc., in the various languages of India such as Hindustani, Punjabi, Bengali, Tamil, Malayalam, and Marathi.

The Ghadarites concluded the need for the renovation of Indian society and presented democratic renewal of India as the agenda of the day.

They concluded that this renewal and renovation could only be achieved by the empowerment and affirmation of the people, and it can only be built by the people themselves. They analyzed

that the present political process, representative democracy, actually disenfranchises the people. Political parties have become gatekeepers of power and have usurped the power of the people, often in the people's name:

"The parliamentary system is in deep crisis not only in India but all over the world. The party in power, Congress (I) and the party in opposition, the BJP, openly declare they will abide by nothing and they are a law unto themselves. There are other political parties who think in the same way. How else is it possible to have riots, disappearances, murders and false encounters if these parties were not a law unto themselves?

The present system, besides not solving any of the problems for the benefit of the people, also appears unable to provide a smooth transfer of governance from one political party to the other. The main cause of this is not that the Congress (I) or BJP are deviants, but that the system demands the existence of such parties for its perpetuation.

People are putting forward their demands and all sections of the people are discontented with the situation, but the system can not satisfy them. There is a real pressure for the creation of a new kind of party, a party which would ensure that these political parties do not keep the people out of power."

It further analyzed:

"The origin of the political system that exists in India and the roots of the crisis of this system can be traced to the Government of India Act of 1935, the transfer of power that took place in 1947 and the constitution that was adopted in 1950...While the democracy that came into being was objectively and advance for the Indian people, it did not lead to their empowerment. This was because this democracy was based on the theory of concentrating power in the executive, in order to deprive the masses of power. The role of the president of India, the frequent declaration of President's Rule at the advice of the cabinet, the ruling party's power to define and redefine state boundaries, the very notion of 'cabinet rule', are all different features of this concentration of power in the hands of the executive."

On the present social development, they state:

"Today, on the eve of the 21st century, nobody can deny that people are born to society and society has a responsibility to look after their well being. This corresponds to the modern definition of rights and is also one of the central aspects of Indian political thought. However according to present day 'Western' ideologues, society has no obligation to anyone except to the financial oligarchy. The so-called individual interest is given primacy over the collective interest and the general interest of society. This imposition of imperialist theories on the soil of India is creating grave complications. It is contributing to the further deepening of the capitalist crisis and causing great resentment amongst the people. The big capitalists and big landlords are using these theories to create serious danger to the very well-being of the people and the future of society."

Following the tradition of the old Ghadarites, they seek the unity of all the peoples to deal with problems facing the society:

"The critical task is to build the political unity of all workers and people of the middle strata who are opposed to the existing state of affairs, especially to the criminalisation of the polity; to the use of state terrorism; to all the attacks on the freedoms of the people; and most importantly who stand for the economic well being of he workers and broad masses of the people. Declaration of this or that phrase from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, without seeking the same afresh from the objective and subjective conditions that confront the people will not contribute to progress whatsoever."

They also point out the reason for the miserable conditions of the people of India;

"Tragically for the working class and the toiling masses of India, emancipation has eluded them. This has happened because the propertied classes have bound them hand and foot to capitalism and to the remnants of feudalism. More importantly, the communist and workers movement has been undermined by social democracy. The fact that European social democracy presents itself in the colours of socialism and communism in

India. The aspirations of the propertied classes created by colonialism and imperialism have dug their poisonous claws into the healthy body of the working class movement for emancipation…"

In the realm of theoretical considerations, the Ghadarites point out the necessity of Indian theory rather than Eurocentric ideas and theories for the liberation of India from hunger and starvation, oppression and exploitation, because these Eurocentric ideas and theories had only served to enslave India, mentally, politically, and economically:

"The starting point, the first step, the most immediate question and the long-term task that appears in India for the victory of the revolutionary movement is that of theory. It expresses itself most succinctly in the necessity for Indian theory, a theory emerging out of the conditions of India..."

The British colonialists attacked the Indian philosophy to the point of denying its existence or distorting it to serve their own ends by imposing irrationalism on Indian philosophy. The Ghadarites point out:

"The stagnation of the philosophy of Darshan is inextricably linked with the stagnation of Indian thought, and of the economic and political theories in our country. The Darshandharis, ensconced within the comfortable walls of Indian, America and British universities, pontificate about Indian philosophy, as if it has no relevance or link with the present conditions in India, with the illumination of the road to progress for the Indian people at this time in history. Idealist and religious interpretations are given of Darshan, to make it lifeless and useless for the Indian people. Meanwhile, deprived of philosophy and outlook to deal with the problems of today, the Indian people are left floundering helplessly, at the mercy of the bourgeoisie and imperialism."

On the task of Democratic Renewal and completing the anti-colonial revolution the Ghadarites point out:

"A thorough going anti-colonial revolution necessarily means ending the capitalist system and its democracy, which has

deprived people of their economic and political power. An anti-colonial revolution, which is merely a matter of formal independence and not a social revolution has become anachronistic.

The entire experience from the time of 'transfer of power' to the Indian bourgeoisie in 1947, with the division of the Indian subcontinent, especially Bengal and Punjab, has proven that this has not led to deep-going transformations. On the contrary, the bourgeoisie has completely obstructed the social revolution. It has been proven that it is capitalism that is the defender of the remnants of feudalism; it is capitalism that is protecting imperialists and colonialist interests; it is capitalism that is the motor behind bourgeoisie in its globalisation of capital and production. Furthermore it is capitalism that has caused disaster in the countryside, deepening the agrarian problems, and trampling underfoot the slogan of the patriotic forces of ' Land to the Tiller'.

Festering at the base of Indian society at this time are capitalism and remnants of feudalism, with the superstructure of imperialism and colonial domination. This has made the conditions of life and work for the working classes and toiling masses extremely miserable. More than fifty percent of Indian people live in abysmal conditions of poverty, victims of malnutrition, ill health, illiteracy and every kind of disease. The government of India's entire program of 'poverty alleviation' has concentrated on juggling the figures prove that the percentage of the Indian people living below the poverty line has been decreasing. Official figures now claim that it is less than 20% of the population. This juggling itself shows the callousness of the Indian state and its rulers, who define poverty levels on the basis of whether people receive a certain amount of calories a day. It distorts the reality that human beings can not exist on the basis of minimum amount of staple food alone. They need other necessities to ensure against malnutrition such as pulses, vegetables, milk and meat; they need potable water, sanitation, health care, proper accommodation and clothes, and a clean, healthy, peaceful and stable environment conducive to living.

They need education and culture, and the satisfaction of working for their ever increasing material and cultural needs."

Ghadarites point out the need for creating and building a new system or a new society in which the needs and claims of all the members of the Indian society will be attended to and honoured:

"The Indian system needs to be renovated with a new system at the base, a system consistent with the aspirations of the working class and the toiling masses, in step with the aspirations of the working class and peoples of the world. Such a system would put the well-being of the masses at the foundation of society as the aim of the economy. Far from making this aim a policy objective, it will become the fundamental law of the land. This new system will not only be modern, and the most up to date, it will also give rise to a confederal state in which all nations and tribal peoples will enjoy full equality and freedom. They will enjoy their right to self-determination up to and including secession, without which self-determination is reduced to a mere phrase. This new system will provide full opportunity to all the nations divided by colonialism to unite if they so desire. The new system will put a complete end to the colonial legacy and India will enter the family of nations as a most progressive force."

The Ghadar movement that started in 1913 amongst the patriotic, progressive and enlightened Indians abroad has gone through a great deal of changes based on the needs of time, but continues to inspire the people. Eighty-five years of struggle have not disheartened them. They still want solutions to their problems. Shaheed Bhagat Singh, who was greatly inspired by the Ghadarites, particularly Kartar Singh Sarabha, wrote prophetically, "Our struggle will continue as long as a handful of men, be they foreign or native, or both in collaboration with each other, continue to exploit the labour and resources of our people. Nothing shall deter us from this path."

The history of Ghadar Movement clearly bears out the truth of Bhagat Singh's statement. It is also a reflection of the deep love that the South Asians resident abroad have for their countries,

and that they are second to none in making sacrifices for the cause of freedom, dignity and prosperity. Although they may be resident abroad, due to the conditions back home, the flame of liberty of their lands is lit in their hearts and they do not hesitate to make any sacrifice for the liberation of their countries and a life of honour and dignity. The Ghadar Movement shows that they will carry on seeking solutions to the problems that plague them both at home and abroad. It also shows that the South Asians are part of their nations no matter where they are resident and they are moved by the concerns of their nations.

Bibliography

Anthony, J. Parel : *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, New Delhi, Vistaar, 2002.

Arabinda Poddar : *Tagore : The Political Personality*, Kolkata, Indiana, 2004.

Arun, Pseud.: *Testament of Subhas Bose*, Delhi, Rajkamal Pub., 1946.

Ashton, S.R.: *British Policy Towards the Indian States, 1905-1939*, London, Curzon, 1982.

Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam: *India Wins Freedom*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1959.

Bearce, George D.: *British Attitudes Towards India 1784-1858*, Oxford, University Press, 1961.

Bhattarcharjea, Ajit: *Countdown to Partition: The Final Days*, New Delhi, HarperCollins, 1998.

Bose, S. C., *The Indian Struggle, 1920-1942*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Calvocoressi, Peter, and Guy Wint: *The Total War: the Story of World War II*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972.

Charles Howard McIlwain: *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern*, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1958.

Chatterji, Joya: *Bengal Divided: Hindu Communalism and Partition, 1932-1947*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Chaudhuri, N.C.: *Thy Hand, Great Anarch!: India 1921-1952*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1987.

Derrett, J. : *Religion, Law, and the State in India*, London, Faber, 1968.

Dixit, Prabla: *Communalism: A Struggle for Power*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1981.

Foreman-Peck J. and Millward, R: *Public and Private Ownership of British Industry 1820-1990*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.

Gandhi, P. Jegadish : *Dr. Abdul Kalam's Futuristic India*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi, 2006.

Ghose, S.K.: *Politics of Violence: Dawn of a Dangerous Era*, Springfield, Nataraj, 1992.

Habberton, William: *Anglo-Russian Relations Concerning Afghanistan 1837-1907*, Urbana, University of Illinois, 1937.

Hasrat, Bikrama Jit: *Anglo-Sikh Relations, 1799-1849; A Reappraisal of the Rise and Fall of the Sikhs*, Hoshiazpur, Local Stockists vv Research Institute Book Agency, 1968.

Hurewitz, Jacob C.: *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record 1535-1914*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.

Huttenback. Robert A.: *British Relations with Sind 1799-1843; An Anatomy of Imperialism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California, 1962.

Kelly, John B.: *Britain and the Persian Gulf 1795-1880*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Nair, A. M.: *An Indian Freedom Fighter in Japan*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1983.

Nair, Janaki: *Women and Law in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Kali, 1996.

Noorani, A.G. : *Indian Political Trials : 1775-1947*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Norris, James A.: *The First Afghan War 1838-1842*, Cambridge, University Press, 1967.

Ray, B.N. : *Gandhigiri : Satyagraha After Hundred Years*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2008.

Rosen, P.: *Societies and Military Power: India and its Armies*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1996.

Singhal, D. P.: *India and Afghanistan: 1876-1907. A Study in Diplomatic Relations*, St. Lucia, University of Queensland, 1963.

Sivaram, M.: *The Road to Delhi*, Rutland, Vt., C.E. Tuttle Co., 1967.

INDEX